

FINAL REPORT  
(internal research project)


AUTHOR: J. Heward

TITLE: History of Bilingualism and  
Biculturalism in the Canadian  
Public Service

DIV: IV

Report no. 34





Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2024 with funding from  
University of Toronto

<https://archive.org/details/31761120625272>

CA1 Z1

763 B500

HISTORY OF BILINGUALISM  
AND BICULTURALISM  
IN THE CANADIAN PUBLIC SERVICE

Internal Research Project of the  
Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism

91-23  
105-67

J. Heward

July, 1966.





## TABLE OF CONTENTS

History of Bilingualism and Biculturalism in the Canadian  
Public Service

(Judith Heward under the direction of Dr. Meyer Brownstone  
Project 820 - 256)

	<u>Page</u>
a) Introduction: the staffing system and representation	1
b) The Lapointe Papers	6
A. 1. The early service	6
2. Lapointe and the bureaucratic ideal	10
B. Language use in correspondence and documents	12
C. Representation	15
1. From Quebec in the Federal Public Service	15
2. Legislation	17
3. Efficiency	24
4. Patronage	31
c) The special Liberal caucus committee	43
1. The Gordon Commission of 1946	43
2. The special Liberal caucus group	43
3. The Jean investigation	46
4. Difficulties	48





Page

5. Reaction to the Jean investigation	50
6. Conclusion	52
d) The Glassco Commission	53
1. The terms of reference	53
2. The special Committee's findings	58
3. The government's attitude	63
e) Current atmosphere and activity	64
f) Conclusion	72
Appendix A	74
Appendix B	106
Appendix C	155





## REFERENCES

1. Max Weber: the Theory of Social and Economic Organization, referred to by John Porter in The Vertical Mosaic, chap. 14, 419 University of Toronto Press, Toronto, 1965.
2. Ibid, 419
3. Ibid, 420
4. Ibid, 420
5. An article by John Porter, "Higher Public Servants and the Bureaucratic Elite in Canada", in Canadian Public Administration, by J.E. Hodgetts and D.C. Corbett, 322.
6. Ibid, 322
7. J.E. Hodgetts, "Pioneer Public Service", Chap. 4, 53 University of Toronto Press, 1956.
8. Ibid, chap. 5, 57
9. Ibid, chap. 5, 52
10. Jean Charles Bonenfant: in l'Action, April 16, 1964: "Les Injustices dans le Fonctionnarisme de 1864" from





Document 58, Session of the Quebec Legislative Assembly, 1864.

11. John Porter: The Vertical Mosaic, chap. 14, 419.
12. "Administration du personnel dans le service public", Revue de la législation régissant le service civil", la Commission du Service Civil du Canada, 1958.
13. Ibid, Section 59, 24
14. Ibid, p.8
15. R. M. Dawson "The Canadian Civil Service" referred to by John Porter, in The Vertical Mosaic, ch. 14, 419
16. R. M. Dawson: (verify)
17. Steiner, H. Historical Background, Report to the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, 1966
18. R.M. Dawson "The Canadian Government" from Personnel Administration, "The Public Service", p. 136
19. Steiner, Hillel, Historical Background
20. Ibid,
21. R.M. Dawson, "The Canadian Government", University of Toronto, 1963, p. 286





BIBLIOGRAPHY (STUDY 820-256)

- John Porter                      The Vertical Mosaic, Toronto,  
(University of Toronto Press) 1965
- Mason Wade                   The French Canadians, Toronto  
(MacMillan) 1956
- Pickersgill, J.                  The Mackenzie King Record: vol. 1,  
Toronto, 1960
- Hodgetts, J.E.                  Pioneer Public Service, University  
of Toronto Press, Toronto, 1955
- Hodgetts, J.E.  
and Corbett, D.C.              Canadian Public Administration,  
Toronto (MacMillan) 1960
- Taylor Cole                      The Canadian Bureaucracy (Durham,  
N.C. 1949)
- Civil Service  
Commission                      Personnel Administration in the  
Public Service, 1958
- Report on Administrative Classification in the Public  
Service, Queen's Printer (1946)
- J. Donald Kingsley              Representative Bureaucracy The  
Antioch Press (Yellow Springs,  
Ohio, 1944)



- Mason Wade                      Canadian Dualism, University of  
Toronto Press (Toronto 1960)
- N. Walker                           Morale in the Civil Service,  
Edinburgh (1961)
- C. Wright Mills                   White Collar (Doubleday 1952)





# A HISTORY OF BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM IN THE FEDERAL PUBLIC SERVICE

## The staffing system and representation

### Introduction

To trace the history of bilingualism and biculturalism in the Canadian Public service is to follow a development in the bureaucracy from its early patrimonial form, towards a goal<sup>1</sup> of the modern efficient bureaucracy, based on Weber's model.

The impetus toward this goal was a desire for an efficient administration. Since by far the dominant part in the bureaucracy was played by English-speaking people of Anglo-Saxon tradition, the goal of efficiency was interpreted in the sense of that tradition, bound up with late 19th century ideas inspired from the Protestant Ethic. The first function of this efficiency was to break down the existing system based on privilege. Less attention was paid, however, to another function of efficiency: that of eliminating the traditional forms of recruitment which exclude on the basis of race, religion, or other social characteristics. This second function relates very much

- 
1. Webers's model as described by John Porter<sup>2</sup> contains three significant variables: rationalization, rivalry and openness. Rationalization serves "the principle of efficiency in administration; breaks down traditional forms of recruitment based on privilege, nepotism, and exclusion on the basis of race, religion and other social characteristics."<sup>2</sup>





to the state of bilingualism and biculturalism in the federal public service, for as F.E. Therrien says, in Volume 1 of the Glassco Report: "The position of bilingualism in the federal administration has remained hazy; the problem has never really been faced;..."

Traditional processes worked to ignore the consideration of this other function of efficiency, not so much actively or deliberately, but through the lack of stated policies concerning it; so that traditional forms of recruitment were not examined to see if indeed they excluded on the base of race, religion, region or other characteristics. In other words, the model of the bureaucracy was incomplete in comparison to that described by Porter and Weber: the characteristic of openness was not present. Porter describes openness<sup>3</sup> as "The degree to which the governmental bureaucracy is open to all groups in the society. Where recruitment and promotional policies do not tend to exclude from the top positions individuals of a particular class, ethnic or regional origin, ideological egalitarian principles are served, and at the same time efficiency is reinforced." (4)

But "efficiency" was not seen to be reinforced by such considerations; instead, it came into conflict with them. The apparent conflict has been stated in terms



of efficiency versus representation and is a leitmotiv of any history of the Canadian bureaucracy.

Porter has this to say on the principle of representation in the context of a bureaucracy:<sup>5</sup>

"To be representative, a bureaucracy must contain a reasonable cross section of the population in terms of occupations, social class, ethnic groups..."

"Ethnic, regional and religious affiliations are not rational qualifications for office. Therefore, in the fully developed bureaucracy, and in its elite, one would expect to find these groups represented in about the same proportion as they are to be found in the general population, if the following assumptions are met: that educational facilities to meet the qualifications are equal as between regions, religions and ethnic groups; that no rights to office are denied on ethnic, regional or religious grounds, and that there is equal motivation in these groups to become public servants. Where higher offices are disproportionately distributed, we do not know, without further investigation, which of these assumptions is not being met."<sup>6</sup>

Adherents to the traditional idea of efficiency realized, from their struggle with the early system of patronage, that ethnic, regional and religious considerations were not rational qualifications for office. What was never ensured, by legislative, recruitment, or promotional means, was that a bureaucracy must also contain a reasonable cross section of the population from all groups. Such a consideration became identified with patronage considerations, to the detriment of representation.

As we shall see presently, the complaint from Canadians of French language and origin, has long been that higher





offices were disproportionately distributed. We can assume that one or more of Porter's assumptions have not been met.

It is the purpose of this paper to outline the conflict between traditional ideas of efficiency and merit, the principle of representation in the federal bureaucracy, and to show how the traditional processes worked against representation.





## TABLE OF CONTENT

- A. 1. The Early Service
  - 2. Lapointe and the bureaucratic ideal
- B. Language Use in Correspondence and Documents
- C. Representation
  - 1. From Quebec in the Federal Public Service
  - 2. Legislation
  - 3. Efficiency
  - 4. Patronage



## CHAPTER ONE

### The Early Service

7  
In the very early service, according to J.E. Hodgetts , appointments in the public service were made on patronage considerations. The service was marked "by the cleft which separated the French-speaking and English-speaking members of the Canadian community."

The service was divided into the Canada East - Canada West pattern, each working in its own language, with two sets of corresponding officials, an English Canadian in the Canada West service, a French Canadian in the Canada East branch. This situation, resulting in competition between the two sets of officials, bred a deep mistrust on both sides. This dualism was the cause of much misunderstanding between the two charter groups.

A distinction was made between the so-called 'working departments' and the patronage departments. The former were comprised mainly of English speaking Canadians, the latter contained many French speaking Canadians, who became identified with a patronage system.

Even today, only fifteen percent of the managerial and professional classes of the public service are French-Canadian.





The concept of the bureaucracy differed greatly from present ideas. On both sides, the representational view was the common one, when, "the English-speaking community might raise the political battle-cry, 'rep by pop', the French-speaking community were entitled to answer, 'you already<sup>8</sup> have more than your share of the service offices.'"

Thus, "a standard complaint of the French group..." says Hodgetts, was "that the English-speaking race monopolized the bulk of the positions in the civil service, and, in particular, that they tended to gravitate to all the key<sup>9</sup> managerial posts."

Jean Charles Bonenfant records a complaint in *Le Canadien*, June 15, 1864:

"Du 1<sup>er</sup> janvier 1863 au 1<sup>er</sup> janvier 1864, le gouvernement eut à son emploi 441 personnes et leur versa en traitement \$420,550.60. Des 441 fonctionnaires permanents et temporaires, 249 étaient anglais et 142 français. Les premiers reçurent en 1863, \$292,345.45, et les seconds \$128,205.15. Les employés temporaires anglais et français étaient à peu près de même nombre, mais, chez les employés permanents, 213 étaient anglais et 78 seulement français. Dans les bureaux de l'Assemblée Législative, pas un seul Canadien français n'avait un traitement s'élevant à \$2,000.00, mais 8 anglais recevaient plus que ce montant.

La Confédération naissante ne changea guère la situation ainsi que le révèle un examen rapide des noms des fonctionnaires dans les premiers comptes publics d'Ottawa et même dans les premiers comptes publics de Québec."<sup>10</sup>



Gradually the system began to change toward a goal of "efficiency" although the French Canadians 'standard' complaint remained. As Porter says: "Once civil services are free from political control through patronage, it is possible for a new principle, efficiency, to be served."

The civil service gradually grew toward a more rationalized ideal of the bureaucracy where the technical competence of personnel was to be the prime consideration for obtaining the goal of efficiency. This growth is traced briefly by the Civil Service Commission,<sup>12</sup> in terms of its legislation.

"La Loi de 1918 prévoyait la mise sur pied d'une Commission du service civil indépendante du gouvernement et responsable envers le Parlement seulement. Le motif primordial... était... de sauvegarder le principe du mérite et de protéger le service contre toute pression pouvant s'exercer quant aux nominations et aux promotions dans les services administratifs."

The goal now stated, the Commission goes on to tell of the changes in the service after 1918.

"A la fin de la première Grande Guerre, le Service Civil se composait d'environ 40,000 employés à plein temps et de 20,000 autres employés temporaires, de temps de guerre, dont la plupart ont été remerciés de leurs services dans les deux ou trois années qui ont suivi l'armistice. Mais dans les années subséquentes, même les pires conditions de crise économique n'ont pu empêcher l'expansion croissante des cadres de l'emploi public. En 1939 on comptait 46,000 fonctionnaires de l'Etat, outre plusieurs autres milliers d'employés publics travaillant pour les





Commissions, sociétés et conseils indépendants créés en vue de faire face aux exigences des deux décennies précédentes. La Seconde Guerre mondiale a donné lieu à une expansion encore plus poussée du service civil...<sup>13</sup>

Although the change began after the First World War,<sup>14</sup>  
the period of the most rapid change began in the 1930's  
but in 1936 scarcely more than one-half of the jobs in the  
service were filled by the Civil Service Commission<sup>15</sup> .



## CHAPTER II

Lapointe and the Bureaucratic Ideal

The years from 1945 to 1941 were an important period in the change of the bureaucratic ideal from the old patronage system to the rationalized administration based on technical competence. Throughout these years, Ernest Lapointe, then Minister of Justice in the King government, struggled to achieve a public service, representative of the French speaking group, and proportional to the French-speaking population of the country. His ideal of merit and efficiency were broader based than those of his English-speaking colleagues. While merit in a technical capacity might constitute a certain level of experience and education in a discipline; merit, for Lapointe, within the context of a country composed of two language groups, involved bilingualism, and responsiveness to the needs of both cultures.

One article in the Lapointe papers, probably written about 1940, shows an interest in the idea of a bureaucracy, and contains several suggestions for its organization. The article is entitled "Suggestions pour refréner la tyrannie bureaucratique dans le service publique". (See Appendix A) It outlines three new positions to be created in the service, with the function of reviewing annually the personnel





organization of the service. These positions would also ensure no injustices occurred in the administration. One of the posts was to be filled by a French-speaking Canadian.



## B. Language use in Correspondence and Documents

From both the province of Quebec and from the west came requests to Lapointe to look into questions of language use in the federal public service.

For example, December of 1935, a letter and resolution arrived from the Société des Agronomes canadiens, with the request: "l'honorable ministre du Commerce du Canada soit prié de faire paraître, simultanément à l'avenir, les éditions françaises et anglaises des publications suivantes du Ministère Fédéral de Commerce." Lapointe assured the group five days later that the ministers concerned would indeed be notified, and warned that lapse of time should be allowed for translation of the word into French after its publication in English. Soon afterward came a letter of congratulation from the society "concernant la publication simultanée des textes français et anglais du dernier traité commercial Canadien-Américain."

That Lapointe's role in these matters was well known, at least to many French-Canadians, is evident in a letter he received on March 24, 1936 from the Société St-Jean-Baptiste of Montreal.

"Nous savons que vous ne laissez passer aucune occasion d'affirmer le principe du bilinguisme





officiel au gouvernement fédéral<sup>1</sup>."

Lapointe, too, was the person responsible for arranging that a bilingual government telephone directory be mandatory in Quebec offices of the federal service, as another exchange of letters in July, 1936, illustrates. However, this was not a step quickly accomplished. In 1939, T. Oscar Bouchard wrote to Lapointe's private secretary (then Louis-Philippe Picard) in a letter dated March 30, complaining that bilingual phones directories were still not available in the Quebec offices of the federal government. Lapointe wrote to the Minister of Public Works, M. Cardin, complaining that it was now a period of years that he had been trying to settle the matter in response to many requests. Finally, on the 8th of April of that year, the step was given sanction, although Picard was obliged to say in writing M. Bouchard that: "si certains officiers s'opposent à donner une traduction bilingue, de façon qu'on leur fasse faire des représentations par les officiers de leur ministre."

More difficulties arose when Lapointe tried to arrange for the French Assistant at the Civil Service Commission to have his own telephone in his office. A flood of complaints had been reported to Lapointe's office from French-speaking

---

1. Lapointe had been even responsible for the formulation in French of the oath of allegiance for those French-speaking public servants taking part in the ceremonies surrounding Edward VIII's accession to the throne.



Members, who were not answered in French when they asked  
for the Assistant. (See Appendix A)



## C. REPRESENTATION

### 1. Representation from Quebec in the Public Service Departments.

Lapointe corresponded with C.D. Howe a great deal, sometimes about the legislative aspects of bilingualism, more often about the lack of French-speaking personnel in the Department of Munitions and Supply. (See Appendix A)

Lapointe continually wrote to Howe on the subject of "la trop petite part faite aux Canadiens-français dans l'organisation du ministère," sending copies of these protests to many of his colleagues. Lists of requisitions from Howe's department were sent to him, and checked by him for French-speaking bilingual staff. One list revealed that, as of November 5, 1940, out of 155 requisitions, 14 were bilingual, in theory. Yet another listed November 22 of that year showed that not one member of the department was French-speaking. On this list, Lapointe had pencilled: "Y a-t-il eu amélioration à partir de décembre?"

This strong interest in the question of French-Canadian representation led him to conduct an investigation of the bilingual and bicultural situation in many departments and agencies, from the Air Service employees to the Quebec branch of the Federal Department of Agriculture.





In pleading for better representation, Lapointe often phrased the problem in terms of the provision of bilingual service, so that both groups served by the administration would have service of equal quality. Such was his approach to the Minister of Labour on the subject of the need for French-Canadian assistants in that department. Wilfrid Gariépy had reminded Lapointe of this need, since during the 1935 strike at Three Rivers, federal Labour officials had angered everyone there by their inability to speak French. In the letter to the Minister of Labour, Lapointe suggested: "Vous demanderez que les employés du Département du Travail, du moins ceux qui parcourent la province de Québec, soient<sup>1</sup> bilingues."

---

1. The Ministre of Labour, N.M. Rogers replied on November 25, 1936, stating that he was assured that a certain Mr. Quirk, who was in charge, and from Montreal "spoke French very well" and "got on well" with the representatives of the employees at Three Rivers. He also promised Lapointe that three additional appointments would shortly be made there, through the Civil Service Commission, and that possibly one of these appointments would be a bilingual one.



## C. REPRESENTATION

### 2. Legislation

After the passage of the Lacroix Bill of 1938, Lapointe examined its interpretation to see how it applied to recruitment procedures, as Howe had told him that the bill was responsible for the preponderance in the appointments of English-speaking officers and employees in the Department of Munitions and Supplies.

These were the questions he asked of the Civil Service Commission on the implications of the legislation:

- (1) "La Commission du Service Civil a-t-elle fait des règlements au sujet de la Loi Lacroix - quels sont-ils?"
- (2) Quelles sont les formalités à suivre par chaque département pour obtenir des employés bilingues?
- (3) Auriez-vous l'obligeance de transmettre une copie des formules de réquisitions employées par les divers départements pour demander des employés?
- (4) Les formules des réquisitions des divers départements indiquent-elles où l'employé doit remplir ses fonctions, c'est-à-dire à Ottawa ou en dehors..."

The answer from the CSC was:

..... "La Commission du Service Civil a inscrit dans ses règlements l'article suivant de la Loi Lacroix:

'If an appointment is required in a locality where both English and French are spoken, and the deputy





head of the department in which the appointment is to be made advises the Commission that a knowledge of both English and French is required for the proper performance of its duties, the Commission shall appoint to the position a person who possesses such qualifications".

"So far as the amendment to Section 20 is concerned, I do not think it refers to headquarters positions at Ottawa, such as the various departments and the Central Experimental Farm, but I do consider it applicable to the local Post Office, the local Customs House and the Rideau canal staff".

The interpretation of the Bill clear in his mind, Lapointe tackled Howe in a letter dated December 3, 1940.

"Following our conversation of yesterday, I investigated further as to the reason why there is such a preponderance - I might even say a complete exclusiveness of others - in the appointment of English-speaking officers and employees in the Department of Munitions and Supplies.

You were under the impression, as was Mr. Power, that the provisions of the so-called Lacroix Bill were responsible for that. This is a mistake, because the Civil Service Commission had made a ruling entered in its minutes the 19th of May 1938 reading as follows: "As far as the amendment to Section 20 is concerned, I do not think it refers to Headquarters positions at Ottawa such as the various departments and the Central Experimental Farm, but I do consider it applicable to the local Post Office, the local Customs House and the Rideau Canal Staff". This was signed by the three Commissioners. In practice, the provisions of the Lacroix Bill as was intended by that Bill apply only to outside appointments in the various provincial localities.

You told me that you would be only too pleased if bilingual employees were appointed. I am informed by the Civil Service Commission that



the only thing to do would be to write the word "is" instead of the words "is not" in this sentence of the requisition reading as follows: "A knowledge of both English and French.....required for this position". If this was done the Civil Service Commission would appoint a bilingual officer or clerk in every case. The previous sentence is in the requisition reading as follows: "I certify that the language of the majority of the persons with whom the incumbent of this position will be required to do business is... should not be filled for the positions in the Departments of Ottawa but only for outside positions, but I am told that in every case the requisition contains the word English.

Moreover, my information is that on those requisitions there is usually from your Department the following words:

Note: Mr. .... is well qualified to fill the position. The inference is that the employee has already been selected. I have in my hand a copy of one of those requisitions as filled and signed by the deputy head of your Department."

I am grateful to you to have expressed a full understanding of the difficulty and the problem the present situation creates, and your willingness to take steps that it should be remedied. As I told you yesterday, you have done such tremendously splendid work in the carrying out of the war effort that it is a tragedy that this virtual exclusion of French-speaking Canada from the activities of your Department may cause a dangerous disruption of the unity which is required, and I still believe that it is possible to effect some changes that will greatly improve the conditions I have described."

Howe replied through his secretary, contending that if the word "is" were inserted as Lapointe had suggested, the Civil Service Commission would have no alternative but to





make a bilingual appointment in every case, and thus would "considerably and needlessly restrict the field of selection."

But he also insisted that it had been the policy of the Department, since the preceding June, that "every effort was to be made to increase the number of bilingual appointments." He also claimed that since that time "more than forty additional bilingual employees have been added to the staff".

A refutation of Howe's argument went from Lapointe to Angus A. MacDonald (Acting Minister of Munition and Supply) December 23rd, 1940. "... 1. You state that in response to many requisitions for appointment put forward by your Department, and in which as completed the clause:

"I certify that the language of the majority of the persons with whom the incumbent of this position will be required to do business is.....  
....."(English or French)

Bilingual employees have been assigned.

May I state that in practically all cases where bilingual employees were appointed when the language requirement was English only, they were certified in lower clerical positions grade 1 and 2 by the Civil Service Commission, in order of merit from the eligible lists duly established by competitive examinations, and those certified were considered for employment and accepted by the Department only after it had been





determined that they possessed an adequate knowledge of English.

As far as higher clerical, technical, professional and special positions are concerned, the enclosed list of appointments made in the department of Munitions and Supply for duty in Ottawa since January 1st, 1940 (included in file) is self-explanatory.

2. Regarding my suggestion that "is" instead of "is not" should appear in the clause reading as follows: "A knowledge of both English and French.....required for this positions", you say that were the suggestion followed out, the Commission would have no alternative but to make a bilingual appointment in every case. Indeed, no one will go so far as to request or even suggest that all requisitions should call for bilingual employees now and then however especially for higher classes, would not, in my position, be entirely out of place.

3. In the fourth paragraph of your letter you mention that it is the general practice of the Civil Service Commission to arrange that prospective employees be interviewed by an officer of the Department, as the latter have an intimate knowledge of the requirements of the particular case. I am informed and I can also state from my own observation that with very few exceptions all appointments, outside of the lower clerical and stenographic positions, are made and certified by the Commission on the recommendation of the



Department, and when no recommendations are made, and names are submitted to the Commission by the Department generally, if not always, deciding who should be certified.

4. While I appreciate your remarks at the end of the fourth paragraph of your letter, with reference to bilingual candidates, may I point out that the enclosed list already referred to, will readily show that although the present practice is not altogether exclusive, it is much less inclusive in so far as French-speaking or bilingual candidates are concerned.

5. In the fifth paragraph of your letter you mentioned the fact that due to explicit instructions given by the Deputy-Minister to the personnel section of the Department, and as a result of cooperation on the part of the Civil Service Commission 'a great many bilingual appointments were made'. Here also, the enclosed list makes it clear that these bilingual appointments must have been made in the province of Quebec or in the lower clerical classes, as stated above.

I trust the above explanations and comments will help your to get a better view of the whole situation. The trouble no doubt is due to a certain extent to the fact that all key positions are occupied by English-speaking employees who, being more familiar with persons of their own tongue, naturally recommend them to fill positions under





their jurisdiction. Unquestionably, if there were a little more cooperation on the part of some of the officers of the Department and if some of the key positions were held by bilingual employees the situation could improve.

I thank you very much indeed for the attention you have already given this matter and I have no doubt that you will look further into it with a view of settling it to the utmost satisfaction of all concerned."



## C. REPRESENTATION

### 3. Efficiency

Echoes of the conflict between "efficiency" and representation resound throughout the Lapointe correspondence, nowhere more so than in the exchanges between Lapointe and Howe.

Howe, a successful businessman, English speaking, was very much concerned with 'efficiency'. His concept, however, differed from that held by Lapointe in several important respects. The gap between their ideas on this point prompts the questions: "What is efficiency in a bureaucracy?", and "What constitutes a truly efficient administration in a country of two charter groups, each with a different language and a different culture?", "Is there more than one interpretation of efficiency?". We shall attempt to examine these questions in detail later. For the moment, let us look at evidences of Howe's view of efficiency, one typical of a great many English speaking members of government, and resembling aspects of the late 19th century Protestant Ethic.

Howe received a letter from O. Drouhin, which said, in part:

".....But the French Canadians of Quebec have also other thoughts: among these they deplore the fact that Mr. Howe does not seem to realize that there is a French Province in the Confederation."



"Since the beginning of the war, controllers have been named by your Department from time to time.

Invariably an English name appears on the papers, and when the controller needs an assistant, another English name appears.

And, if by chance a controller is named in the Province of Quebec, it is also English.

The liberals of the Province of Quebec see that with anxiety.

They like their Minister of Supply but they would like him more if he would render justice to the French Canadians."

"The nationalistic elements of Quebec are taking stock continually of these facts and they are exploiting them.

The liberals want to win the war and are ready to make the necessary sacrifices, but they would like also that their race be acknowledged by the Minister of Supply.

They intend to vote liberal at the next election and the speakers of our Party would like to tell to the electors: 'See, Mr. Howe is not only a great executive but he has acknowledged that we are 33% of the population and he has given us justice !'





Now, it is true that at this time the Department was exclusively English. Howe himself said he would be happy to hire French Canadians in connection with the appointment of a Purchasing Agent. However, he claimed that, for that post, there had been no qualified French Canadian, a claim which is quite probable. Whether he was obliged to hire exclusively English Canadians for all positions on the same grounds is contestable. At any rate, the above was the reaction of M. Drouhin, and very likely of many other French Canadians<sup>1</sup>.

Two cases which illustrate Howe's view of efficiency, are the case of the St. Malo shops, and the incident of the letter from Jeunesses Patriotes.

Lapointe, in June of 1940, remonstrated with Howe over tenders to enlarge the St. Malo shops of the department of Munitions and Supply. He felt that the work should be offered to firms of the Quebec City district. Howe, excusing his action on grounds of haste, informed Lapointe that no

- 
1. In sending a copy of this letter to Lapointe, Drouhin hinted that Lapointe's attitude might differ from his own. He writes an accompanying letter to Lapointe on October 3, 1941, saying:

"Monsieur Howe est un des meilleurs cerveaux. C'est un homme nécessaire là où il est, mais je ne sais pas où il a appris la géographie."

"En tout cas, pour lui le Canada est formé de huit provinces et une réserve. La réserve, c'est nous."

"Je ne vous en envoie pas une copie d'avance, car j'aurais peur que vous ne m'approuviez pas."

Lapointe acknowledged the letter without comment.



tenders had been issued, and that Anglin Norcross of Montreal had already been working on the plans for some weeks.

(See Appendix A)

There would naturally be some question whether Howe's action on the Anglin-Norcross Construction at St. Malo could be termed inefficient on the grounds that it angered Quebeckers. Perhaps it was not even unwise politically, in the sense that liberal support from Quebec was so solid that an action of this kind would not necessarily lead to difficulties such as were envisaged by Lapointe.

In the incident concerning the letter to Jeunesses Patriotes, Howe's attitude toward efficiency vis-à-vis questions of language and ethnicity, is clearer.

On April 28, 1936, Howe had written to a M. Réal Denis, the head of Jeunesses Patriotes, in answer to a letter of M. Denis. The letter, exactly as written, is as follows:

Cher monsieur:

J'ai votre lettre du 22 courant, au sujet du project de loi concernant les Ports Nationaux du Canada, maintenant devant la Chambre des Communes. J'ai lu votre communication avec beaucoup d'intérêt, et puis je dire, avec un peu d'étonnement. Evidemment vous êtes sous l'impression que le gouvernement a trahi le Canada Français par le présentation de cette loi. Puis-je vous assurer que ce n'est pas le cas. Dans la préparation et le présentation de ce project de loi le gouvernement a prena en considération l'exploitation compétente des Ports de Nationaux du Canada, et de ce qui est de plu de conséquence, les poches des contribuables Canadiens.





Je crains que vos conclusions sont fondées sur les rapports dans les journaux plutôt que sur les faits. Je conseillerais avant de donner libre cours à quelque nouvel exercice de rhétorique vous conseillerais les provisions de le projet de loi."

(See Appendix A)

This letter was translated from Mr. Howe's English version, by a member of his department's Translation Bureau. Either Howe had not verified the translation before signing it, or perhaps he was indifferent to the whole question of the French language and the feeling of the French language groups. He might however, have been aware that an organization such as Jeunesses Patriotes would have any reply of his published in at least one French language newspaper.

In June, M. Denis vigorously objected to Lapointe the quality of the French in the letter he had received from Mr. Howe, saying, "...vous jugerez vous-même quel beau massacre de la langue française M. Howe nous sert..."

(See appendix A)

One wonders; could these arrangements not have been before?

One might argue quite convincingly that, from this evidence, Howe was very indifferent to the matter of language, and that this indifference constitutes in effect a lacuna in his concept of efficiency. To send a letter such as the



foregoing in such circumstances was surely a very inefficient act of administration, both from a political point of view, and from the point of view of a public service. Had Howe the view of efficiency which took into account the existence of the French language and culture in Canada, he and Lapointe would perhaps have had no difficulties at all.

Both men wanted things done and wanted them done quickly. Whether Lapointe had quite the dollars and cents view of the service generally credited to Howe is arguable; but not essential difference either in approach for operation seems to lie between these two men except in their views of efficiency. In Lapointe's view, it was not efficient to offend a virtual 30% of the population, and care had to be taken even in the smallest matter not to do this. Howe's idea of efficiency seemed to be slightly narrower: a job had to be done quickly, even at the expense of the feeling of the French people, and at the expense also, in the last case, of the French language. This fact would not perhaps have occurred to Mr. Howe, for, in his own terms, he was a supremely efficient administrator. According to J.E. Hodgetts, Howe did possess this blind spot in his view of efficiency; it is only in comparing his attitude on this question of language and culture to that of Lapointe, that this point becomes evident. That there were other interpretations of efficiency did not occur to Mr. Howe. He espoused the traditional view, which prevented him from



recognizing the importance of representation, or its relationship to an efficient public service.





## C. REPRESENTATION

### 4. Patronage

Lapointe seemed to waste no opportunity to remind his Prime Minister of the necessity, (i.e. what he himself regarded as a necessity,) of French Canadian representation on the growing number of special boards and commissions and up by the government. In the following instance he uses what one gathers was a political mistake on the part of Finance Minister Ilesley to point out to King the lack of representation on these boards.

A copy of "Le Jour", a weekly published in Montreal, of December 8th or 9th, edited by J.G. Harvey, where he regrets very bitterly the scarcity of French Canadian employees on the various commissions and bureaus, was sent to King from Lapointe. On October 20, 1941, Lapointe wrote to Ilesley, concerning the appointment of Jacques Panneton to Provincial Controller of Licencing for the Province of Quebec. The said Panneton was a Conservative and "a militant organizer and a personal friend of Duplessis." The letter runs:

"Honourable Philippe Brais told me that it would be a calamity if Panneton is going to have the trade and commerce of the Province of Quebec under his control. He is the sort of man who cannot help being a partisan.



If a staff has to be appointed in Montreal and elsewhere in the Province will this man be in control of the appointments?

Really, my dear Ilsley, I am afraid that this is a mistake of the first magnitude, and it is important to know who is responsible for having submitted his name to you. Surely, in a matter of this importance I might have been consulted..."

In a letter to Prime Minister King, of the October 20, 1941 (the same day) Lapointe then wrote:

"Do you not think that this came as a result of the absence of French Canadians from Quebec on the various boards which advise the Ministers? I have been protesting so often in the past and with such indifferent success that for the last few months I have not said a word about it, seeing that it is a useless waste of energy".

Lapointe had already taken up, in more detail, the question of appointments to special boards and commissions late in 1939 but had met with little success. On the 8th of December, of that year, he sent a letter to Prime Minister King, with copies to all his colleagues (Coleman, Under Secretary of State, Rogers, Minister of Labour, Gardiner of Agriculture, Howe of Transport, Ilsley of National Revenue, Mackenzie of Pensions and National Health, Euler of Trade and Commerce, Ralston of Finance, Crerar of Mines and Resources, and to Power, Postmaster General). The last two paragraphs of this letter read:

"The various presidents and directors of those Commissions bring the men they know as directors or managers or secretaries, and those in turn appoint people they know or who are recommended to them by





people they know and they do not care about anything else. Of course this cannot do. One of these gentlemen to whom a request was made, said that it was done through the Civil Service Commission. The Civil Service Commission claims no responsibility, except in the approval of salaries.

I would be obliged if all the Ministers would give instruction to the heads of those various commissions that this situation must be corrected. The great trouble is that they do not know French Canadians, but I may assure you that in all spheres of active life, professional, commercial, industrial, etc., we have men who are qualified for any work to be done. This must certainly be redressed and I think with some good will it may be easy to redress it."

In answer to the copies of this letter came several replies:

Lapointe's attitude toward a system of patronage in the matter of Public Service appointments. The Dual Service.

Lapointe's whole attitude toward the question of patronage is difficult to determine. Certainly the service was not free from patronage at this time. R. Macgregor Dawson refers to a description given in the House of Commons by a member of Parliament.

16

"The chief handicap on the Commission has been imposed by the ten members of this House who are determined to force political patronage upon the Civil Service. One of the most astounding revelations made before that Committee was that which showed the growth of political patronage in connection with appointments to the Civil Service under the present administration. We were presented with long lists



containing thousands of positions which had been exempted from the provisions of the Civil Service Act, first by statute, again by the estimates, and again by orders-in-council. This has had a demoralizing result within the Civil Service, since we have attempted to merge two systems, a merit system under the Civil Service Commission, and a political patronage system, with all the conflict and confusion thus involved....."

"The Civil Service Commission has made an honest attempt to establish the principle that appointments to the civil service of Canada should be available to every citizen of the Dominion, and that appointments should be secured by open competitive examination. There is no proper system of qualification, there is no suggestion of competition when appointments are made on the recommendation of a sitting member, a defeated candidate, or a political committee."

It should be noted that the part of the public service exempt from the provisions of the Civil Service Act consisted mainly of English Canadian patronage appointments. On the one hand, the Civil Service Commission strove to create a modern bureaucracy; on the other hand a large system of political patronage continued and grew. Lapointe was certainly well aware of this fact. His intention was that, since the patronage system existed, it should contain a fair representation of French Canadian appointments.

However, there are two clear indications of Lapointe's action in response to requests for a position, whatever may have been his feelings about the patronage system. The first instance is shown by a letter from Lapointe to Pierre





Casgrain, then Secretary of State, dated February 8, 1940. Casgrain had evidently asked him to fill certain positions with people who had made representation to Casgrain.

"Vous êtes certainement au courant du fait que le patronage ne peut plus exister dans ces emplois et que le personnel est choisi par le Bureau de Placement provincial.....

Je transmets votre liste immédiatement à Monsieur Bouchard, lui demandant de voir s'il n'y avait pas moyen de placer au moins quelques-unes de ces personnes."

A second instance of Lapointe's action in the face of a request for a position is contained in his reply of 17 August, 1938 to M. Robert Taschereau, who had requested a position in Lapointe's department.

".....Quant à ce qui concerne Ottawa, vous n'ignorez pas qu'aucun officier ne peut être nommé au département de la Justice autrement que par l'entremise de la Commission du Service Civil, après que des applications ont été demandées de la manière voulue par la loi. Il y a la question d'âge, qui serait pour vous un obstacle insurmontable. Je désirais l'an dernier avoir M. Pigeon de Québec, qui avait accepté d'entrer à mon ministère, mais toutes les formalités l'ont découragé et à la fin il a refusé, à mon grand désappointement. Le seul moyen où je pourrais peut-être vous être utile serait d'essayer de vous envoyer des affaires du ministère si vous vous remettez à la pratique de votre profession. Même là il y a une concurrence formidable et nous ne pouvons faire beaucoup d'une façon individuelle....."

It may be that Lapointe viewed patronage with a tolerant eye, both as a means to increase the participation by his compatriots in the administration, and as a system still





very common in the government at that time, as Dawson has pointed out. It is important to notice that on neither occasion did he break the rules concerning recruiting of personnel. His remarks on the bureaucracy, too, indicate his acceptance of the examination system. Since patronage was still rife, and the bureaucratic ideal not fully developed, there may be some ambiguity in his attitude, although there is no instance recorded of his acting otherwise than in accordance with the Civil Service Commission.



## CONCLUSION

The brief examination of the Lapointe papers shows something of the efforts Lapointe made towards maintaining representation in the public service, and towards establishing a measure of bilingual service in as many departments of the service, (and the Civil Service Commission,) as possible. It was, for the most part, an unassisted task. There had been no major language legislation since 1888,<sup>17</sup> and it was not until 1938 that the principle embodied in the Lacroix bill, that of service to the public through language, was achieved; even then evoking fears that the merit principle would be endangered. At the same time, as R.M. Dawson points<sup>18</sup> out :

"It is necessary to remember.....that the 'civil service' proper is now less than half the total of public employees, and that the bulk of employees belong to a second 'outside service'."

This trend, already evident during Lapointe's time, caused the protests against patronage to lose much of their force. The fact that the bulk of the service still operated on the patronage system, while representation was unheeded in the name of the merit principle, made the work situation for Lapointe, and the principle of efficiency highly ambiguous.

Even in spite of the legislation that was passed, Lapointe's efforts went almost entirely unaided. In 1932,

---

18. R.M. Dawson the Canadian Government from Personnel Administration in the Public Service. p. 136





an amendment to the Act of 1918<sup>19</sup> stipulated a requirement of a year's residence before appointment to a field post. This measure was designed to eliminate the holding of federal posts in Quebec province by persons not of Quebec, and not of the French language. However, in the Quebec Branch of the Department of Munitions and Supply, not one French Canadian was appointed, even as late as 1941, and although Lapointe complained constantly about this point, the Act of 1908's ruling on the matter still held: the restriction of the Civil Service Commission's authority to recruiting for Ottawa only, while field appointments were to remain a departmental responsibility.

What support Lapointe received was random and informal. Some of his colleagues would express agreement with one or more of his representations to King, or to Howe, but as far as formal legislation was concerned, virtually none of Lapointe's desired reforms were adopted. A quick review of the legislation dealing with bilingualism in the service will show that except for the guarantee of a fifty dollar bonus for ability to compose in the second language of a candidate for a Civil Service given position, in 1888, there was no further legislation until 1938. In 1923 a restatement of the bilingual examination principle was issued, but the only piece of major language legislation during Lapointe's whole career was the Lacroix bill of 1938.



Why did Lapointe fail to obtain measures for the limited bilingual service he desired, and for representation of the French Canadian element within the Federal Service? In part, of course, his failure was due to the fact that the changeover from the patronage system made members of the service highly suspicious of the idea of representation, as being inimical to the merit and efficiency principles.

Perhaps another reason for Lapointe's failure to gain some formal recognition of his aims with regard to the public service centered around the idea of efficiency, in a bureaucracy aiming toward a development from a patronage system toward a rationalized bureaucracy. The differing concept of efficiency indicate how they could have been at the heart of a more generalized disagreement, or lack of understanding, between members of the two charter groups in the service. Howe seems to express the ideas generally held by English-speaking members of the public service: a narrow concept of efficiency; technical competence in recruiting and promotion; the rationalized, rivalled, but not necessarily open system of the bureaucracy; and, to a greater degree perhaps than the rest of his English speaking colleagues, speed of operation. For Lapointe, the establishment of an adequately bilingual and bicultural service was one of the most important factors in the efficient administration of a country containing two charter





groups, one English-speaking, the other French-speaking, his interpretation of efficiency, broader-based.

One could go even further, and detect in Howe, from the correspondence presented, definite undertones of prejudice. (Much later in time Howe was known to split a high public service post into two sections when a French Canadian was incumbent, on the grounds that no French speaking Canadian could handle the whole post.) The attitude indirectly expressed throughout Howe's dealings with Lapointe was one of complete indifference to the questions of language and ethnicity. On the occasions when Lapointe made insistent representations to Howe, the latter's response veered slightly toward the defensive. How much his attitude was shared by his English speaking colleagues, and by King himself, is a matter that would necessitate closer examination. In the opinion of a French Canadian public servant who worked under King, King shared Howe's indifference to the question.

In the conflict represented by Howe and Lapointe, the traditional processes won out. Not until the Glassco Commission was appointed in 1960 did the question of re-interpretation of efficiency arise.

What was the fate of the French Canadian in this rapidly changing public service? Norman Ward gives a brief





20

account:

"It is no accident that the French Canadian complainant correlated the decline of the French with the reform of the civil service beginning in 1918, for the expansion of the Dominion Government in the last few decades was at first characterized, as was the entire civil service after Confederation, by exclusively English-Canadian thinking. Applicants for civil service posts have for years been able to elect to write examinations in French or English anywhere in Canada, and French Canadians have always held a share of posts, usually among the minor ranks, and especially in departments staffed by the patronage method. But as the technical requirements of the service have grown, and as English Canadians staff most of the higher ranks, the senior departmental officers have not unnaturally sought more English Canadians to work with, and until after the Second World War, the proportion of French Canadians in the total service was dropping steadily. As recently as the war, a French Canadian cabinet minister could find himself marooned at the head of a predominantly English Canadian organization in which English was the only departmental language and only English-Canadian ideas influenced the formation of policy and the organization of the department itself."

Because of the atmosphere of general unconcern with questions that were to the French Canadian of prime importance, his place in the service was likely to be lesser in comparison to that of his English speaking compatriots.

21

Ward notes:

".....in 1918, before the creation of the Civil Service Commission under the federal administration, the proportion of French Canadian civil servants amounted to 21.5%, while in 1946 the proportions was down to 12.5%. What is worse, with respect to salaries of \$6,000 or more a year, the proportion of French Canadians fell from 25% in 1918 to 9.52% in 1946."



From the Lapointe papers, then, several possible reasons for the decline in participation on the part of French speaking Canadians in the public service, are evident. As is  
 22  
 stated by R.M. Dawson:

"Efficient administration depends on the recruitment of civil servants of first rate ability and the creation of an environment which will demand their utmost in initiative, resourcefulness, and conscientious devotion to the welfare of the state."

It is evident from this study that the second of these requirements has not been met with regard to the French speaking group in Canada.

This one-man pressure group failed to bring about any policy change towards the problems of representation and bilingual service. He failed in an atmosphere unsympathetic to his aims, indeed, in some cases, oblivious to them. The worship of a narrowly defined merit principle had worked against his efforts. Was he himself conscious of the problem in these terms, conscious of this direction in which the bureaucracy was tending? Perhaps not fully; yet certainly through an instance such as that of the St. Malo shops, he could see principles he valued being sacrificed to something called efficiency; something he might rather have termed 'haste'.





### C. THE SPECIAL LIBERAL CAUCUS GROUP

1. The Gordon Commission of 1946
2. The special liberal caucus group
3. The Jean investigation

In 1946, appeared the Report of the Royal Commission on Administrative Classification in the Public Service. Its terms of reference included the aim of maintaining efficient standards of administration in the Federal Public Service. Within the scope of these terms of reference were also: (The Gordon Commission Report, 1946)

".....such other matters as may, in the opinion of the Commissioners, relate to the maintenance of efficient standards of administration in the public service....."

The Montreal Chamber of Commerce presented a brief to this Commission in the form of detailed informations, facts and figures, on French Canadian representation in the Service. This brief furnished much ammunition for French speaking Members of Parliament. (See Appendix B, excerpts from House of Commons Debates)

Little mention was made of this brief or of bilingualism and biculturalism in the Gordon Commission Report. On page 18 of The Gordon Commission Report it is stated:

".....It was represented to us that the number of French speaking Canadians in administrative and other senior positions is



relatively small. This system, which is obviously undesirable, is due in large measure to the existing system of classification and recruitment .....

Evidently, these matters were not considered to be relevant to the efficient administration of the Public Service. It was not until 1962, when the Committee on Bilingualism of the Glassco Commission was formed, that the relationship between the efficient administration of the service on the one hand, and representation and bilingualism, on the other, was discussed in a systematic manner.

Towards the end of 1946, or the beginning of 1947, (the Clerk of Committees has no record of the date of its formation), a special group of French-speaking members of Parliament, chosen from the Liberal caucus, began to meet, by itself, and with Government representatives, sitting between and during sessions of Parliament. It met at first on an "unofficial" basis, to discuss questions of representation and bilingualism in the public service. Considerable noise was made by its members, and other French parliamentarians in the House. (See Appendix B) The data on French Canadian participation in the service, culled from the Report of the Montreal Chamber of Commerce to the Gordon Commission, was used as a basis for strong recommendations in the House.

This group of five men was known as "The Committee of Five", or "Little Chicago". The members (verified by the



Clerk of Committees), were: Roch Pinard, Bona Arsenault, René Beaudoin, Gleason Belzile, and Wilfrid Lacroix.

Their Chairman was Roch Pinard. At the time of the Committee's formation, its members claimed that only 10% of the civil servants in Canada were French speaking, and of 20 deputy ministers none were. (See Appendix B)

According to a former associate of the Committee, it was formed, not only to protest the insufficiency of French Canadians in senior public service posts, but also to promote the interests of Quebec in general. The associate, during an interview, claimed that the group was so vociferous, that by early summer of 1947, Mackenzie King decided that something must be done to quieten it. What he did was to give the Committee an 'official' character, by asking the Hon. Joseph Jean, then Solicitor General, to act as a liaison between the Cabinet and Little Chicago, in an investigation of the bilingual and bicultural situation in departments and agencies of the Government.





### The Jean Investigation

The Committee made at least six reports to the Cabinet, as a result of twenty-three meetings prior to July 3, 1947, according to newspaper accounts. (See Appendix B) On June 27th of that year, after a Cabinet meeting, Mr. King sent M. Jean a letter appointing him to his investigation. At the meeting, reference had been made to the importance in the national interest of securing and maintaining in the Public Service a just proportion of Canadians of French origin. It had been pointed out that a serious effort should be made to find means of adjusting the balance and of making available for appropriate positions suitably qualified French Canadians. Solicitor General Jean was to review with the Ministers responsible, and with deputy heads, as well as with representatives of the Civil Service Commission, each of the departments and agencies of the government, with the object of reporting upon methods which might be adopted to improve the present position.

M. Jean met with his own working committee (David Henry, Benoit Godbout, and Paul Pelletier), on July 2, 1947. (See Appendix B for Minutes of this meeting)

By the following day, July 3, there was formal recommendation to the Cabinet from the Committee of Five, reported



in the Ottawa Journal, to appoint three new Deputy Ministers, and an additional four French Canadian deputies were also shortly to be recommended. Further reports were to be tabled subsequent to July 3, advising the appointment of dual deputies in at least four departments: Agriculture, Mines and Resources, Justice, and Trade and Commerce. (See Appendix B)





Difficulties in exploration of the activities of the  
Committee of Five, and of the Jean Committee 1947-9

The two major difficulties consisted in the lack of information from people connected with the Committee of Five's The Jean investigation, and in the lack of documents.

Not even the Office of the Privy Council revealed any trace of the six reports from the Committee of Five to the Cabinet. There may even have been more than six, although the newspapers referred to that number in their accounts of the week of June 27th to July 3. No trace of any letter appointing M. Jean to his enquiry, or of one appointing the Committee of the Five to "officially" investigate the problem of French Canadian participation in the Service, establishing "a degree of permanency" to the Committee. No trace was found either, of the brief of the Montreal Chamber of Commerce to the Gordon Commission of 1946, which consisted of figures taken from a survey of French participation in the Public Service. Nor did any response come from the Chamber of Commerce to a request for their brief, and/or information about the manner in which their enquiry was conducted. To date, the Jean report itself has not been found, if, in fact it was written, as the speech of Mr. Langlois, on February 24, 1949, seems to imply.



Interviews with Senior Public Servants were not more helpful. One dossier finally did turn up containing the minutes of some of the meetings, while another dossier produced some others. The people involved in almost every case refused to let the memoranda they had written be used in any way, or, in some instances, even seen. One man, who had been thoroughly involved in the meetings of the committee, denied any knowledge at all of the investigation. Almost all respondents admitted of no instances of efforts to increase participation by French speaking Canadians in the Public Service at any time. It was due to the efforts of only two or three people that any documents at all were made available to this Commission.



### Reaction from other Sources

Reaction to the responsibility of appointments going to the Committee drew widespread comment. F. Jaenicke told the Ottawa Journal on June 30, 1947:

"It is quite wrong that a committee of the House of Commons should be given the right even to recommend appointees for higher Civil Service positions. It is a return to the old patronage system, and a bypassing of the Civil Service Commission."

Again, matters of representation had become identified with patronage, and were then enemies of efficiency and merit.

The Journal of June 28, interpreted the Committee's activities another way:

".....all jobs (should) be filled by the best men available regardless of race, but...the French Canadians race (should) not be overlooked in the search for qualified men."

The Committee of Five was ostensibly appointed for a long period, but it is not known just when it dissolved, questions were asked about the investigation as late as February, 1949. (See Appendix B)





The Plan of The Jean Committee

Meetings further to July 2 gave rise to periodic reports on progress. A questionnaire was sent to all departments and agencies of the Government, and meetings with deputy ministers and heads of departments were held. After August 7, letters were sent out to educational institutions in the province of Quebec, in the hope | of encouraging applications to the Public Service. A date was set for a meeting with<sup>1</sup> the heads of these institutions.

M. Jean also resolved to undertake a study of special Boards and Commissions, with emphasis on the Bank of Canada and the CBC.

- 
1. University of Montreal, the Engineering Institute of Montreal, University Laval, The Montreal Technical Institute, l'Ecole des Hautes Etudes Commerciales, l'Ecole des Mines de Québec, McGill University.



Response of the Departments toward Mr. Jean's inquiries.

During M. Jean's interviews with deputy ministers and their equivalents, the general response was the same. Many excuses were given when figures representing French Canadians in responsible positions were low. One man said that he could not get bilingual French Canadians to fill more than four of his twenty-five top posts, due to the fact that all bilingual French Canadians went to work in industry in Quebec. Another man, in the Department of Reconstruction said that the Department of Munitions and Supply had taken all the French Canadians from the province of Quebec, and left none qualified to fill positions in his department. Another man claimed to be waiting for a "French Dr. Skelton." In the armed forces, a quota of 15% was allotted to French-speaking non-commissioned officers in the infantry, allegedly to that they could rise to high positions.

In the meeting with the representatives of education in Quebec, Mr. Jean and the representatives "heartily endorsed" the suggestion that the Jean investigation be established on a permanent basis, co-operating with the universities, and with an official character. No government representative besides M. Jean was present at this meeting.





### Conclusion of the Investigation

No record of either committee's activities is, at this time, to be found according meetings after November, 1947. On March 18, 1948, a question was asked of Mr. King in the House concerning the results of the investigation. Mr. King replied that no decision had been taken on when M. Jean would submit a report to the Cabinet, nor was it clear what form this report would take. On February 24 of the following year, M. Langlois referred to the Jean report, in a manner which implied that he had read it. Efforts to locate this report have been unsuccessful, although a memorandum found among minutes of M. Jean's meetings with his committee speak of "the forthcoming report" of M. Jean. How much improvement in the participation among French-speaking Canadians followed the investigations is outside the scope of this study.



#### D. THE GLASSCO COMMISSION

In 1965, the Royal Commission on Government Organization, appointed in September, 1960, presented its 630 page Report.

From March 1961, to February, 1962, a Committee of the Commission had systematically gathered data on the bilingual and bicultural situation in departments and agencies of the Government. For a full listing of the topics studied, see Appendix C.

The Committee covered at last fourteen aspects of the problems of representation and bilingualism. Discussion groups of members of the committee had researchers divided into teams, interviews and surveys conducted and tabulated. From all the material gathered, only ten pages are accorded the findings in the Final Report. No specific recommendations were made regarding the question save for Mr. Glassco's statement on page 29.

The reason given for this apparent neglect of so much bilingual and bicultural material, was that the problem was beyond the scope of the Commission's mandate.

This reason may seem spurious after an examination of the activities of the Committee on Bilingualism, just prior to, and during, its initial meeting on July 12, 1961. At





that time, the relevance of the problem to the terms of reference had been thoroughly debated. Memoranda were prepared on the subject; and discussed in and outside of the meeting. It was agreed by the members of the Committee, at the outset, that bilingualism and biculturalism were matters which fell well within the range of problems to be studied by the Commission. This fact was summed up by one of the Committee members:

"The general mandate of the Commission is 'to enquire into and report upon the organization and methods of operation of the departments and agencies of the Government of Canada, and to recommend the changes therein which they consider would best promote efficiency, economy, and improved service in the dispatch of public business. (The Royal Commission on Government Organization Vol. 1, 1965) Therefore, any study made with the purpose of making suggestions as to improvements in the dispatch of public business in Canada has to take into account the bicultural and bilingual aspects for the country. This fact was recognized by the Commission since the bilingual question had been included in the initial area of investigation, and since a special co-ordination committee on bilingualism was formed within the Commission."

This first meeting was held on July 12, with Acting Chairman R.J. Grenier presiding. Eighteen members were present, and much of the discussion centred around the relevance of bilingualism to the mandate of the Commission. It was agreed that bilingualism should not be treated as a problem of 'justice' but as one of 'efficiency'.





Even before the first meeting, there were statements of this problem of relevance. One member prepared a memorandum on May 24, 1961, in which he outlined the relationship of bilingualism to efficiency as he saw it:

"D'après le décret en conseil du 16 septembre, auquel la Commission doit son existence, l'enquête a pour but "d'assurer l'efficacité l'amélioration des services tout en réalisant des économies....."

"On doit donc se demander s'il y a un rapport entre bilinguisme et efficacité. En d'autres termes, peut-on rendre l'administration plus efficace en améliorant le bilinguisme?"

".....Une fois admise, l'existence de deux groupes linguistiques distincts jouissant des mêmes droits, il s'agit de savoir si ces deux groupes sont desservis avec une égale efficacité par l'administration. C'est là une tâche qui doit, nous semble-t-il, incomber normalement à la Commission."

He went on to emphasize the importance of the problem of bilingualism:

"Théoriquement, le problème du bilinguisme devrait concerner aussi bien l'élément anglais que l'élément français, puisque: a) tous les employés fédéraux connaissent l'anglais b) presque toutes les publications du fédéral sont rédigées en anglais, les textes français n'étant que des traductions."

Bilingualism was not the sole aspect of the problem that was discussed. One member stated that:

".....the present system (recruitment, promotion) is grossly unfair and is..... incompatible with the merit system."



Another felt that the central question was:

"To what extent do the large size and the regional and social diversity of Canada require that the federal public service be 'a representative bureaucracy...?' .....In part, (French Canadian) demands for adequate recognition in the federal administration is a special case of the widespread demand for a representative bureaucracy as a means of ensuring that the federal public service has a proper understanding of and responsiveness to the special needs and interests of the various regional and social groups of the country. To assess what this demand means for the organization and operation of the public service is part of the task of the Royal Commission, but the matter of bilingualism could be approached independently."

This member claimed that the Heeney Report on Personnel Administration had made relatively modest recommendations on the question of bilingual service (See A History of Legislation in the Public Service, Steiner) and added:

"It seems, however, only logical to conclude that Canadian citizens may reasonably expect to deal with the federal public service at all levels in whichever of these two official languages they prefer. In part, but only in part, this is a localized matter, as it has in fact, been treated in the past. On two counts.....it is of significance to the entire service: first, to treat it on a purely local plane is bound to frustrate proper career development in the service; second, most, if not all, departments and agencies must be concerned in their headquarters operations and senior levels of management, with both English-speaking and French-speaking elements of the public."

Yet another member of the Committee spoke on the relationship of representation to the merit principle, a factor in efficiency.





"While the appointment to any post must be decided on merits and competency, it must be borne in mind that even such factors as merits and competency can be quite relative, depending on the context in which they are evaluated."  
"This might have been directed at critics of advocates for a degree of representation in a bureaucracy who contended that such a consideration was contrary to the merit principle."

Finally, the members agreed to proceed with the study of the problem on this note:

".....the present approach to bilingualism in the public service - which seems to treat it as a matter of providing minimal satisfaction to French Canadian demands for French versions of public documents, and for French-speaking staffs in predominating French communities, is open to criticism. In effect, it seems to rest on an unconscious assumption that the existence of two official languages in Canada is a transitory nuisance. Recognition that the bilingual character of the Canadian public is a permanent condition suggests that there must be a more positive approach to the development of an adequately bilingual service." (A Member of the Committee)



### Findings of the Committee

In so far as concerned particular aspects of the administration, Commissioner Therrien found representation to be insufficient, recruiting procedures for French-speaking Canadians to be discriminatory, the number of bilingual posts insufficient, and the working conditions generally for the French Canadian public servant far from optimal, as regarded language use, and rewards for bilingual skills. The number of bilingual forms and documents was far from satisfactory; a more major problem was that of translation and information services. French language use in hospitals was severely limited; the educational system in Federal schools neglected bilingual instruction.

There, then, were some of the Committee's findings after eight or nine months of study. It is important to notice that nowhere in the remarks of M. Therrien do recommendations appear, although many very specific recommendations were made by the Committee on completion of the studies. (See Appendix C)

The nature of the recommendations made by the Committee may be seen through several examples. With reference to educational goals of the public service, this was suggested:

"To make civil servants bilingual after entry should be the educational aim of the



Government, with French language courses available to all." there:

And further:

"Premiums should be given for bilingualism, considered to be a higher skill."

Another recommendation advocated the establishment of a kind of ombudsman for matters pertaining to bilingualism:

".....un comité permanent sur le bilinguisme dans chacun des ministères et l'étude des doléances et revendications du public concernant le bilinguisme."

Why was only one very general recommendation made in the final report? How did it happen that Eugène Therrien's ten pages on the problem of bilingualism constitute a minority report only? Most important of all, what was the reason for appointing a Committee, financing the work of a hundred and fifty staff members for a period of almost a year, to conduct detailed investigation, if virtually none of the material was to be published? What was the relevance of the problem to the terms of reference so clearly established only to be denied at the time of publication? And why did the Commission ignore the words of a member of the Bilingualism Committee?

".....This Royal Commission cannot afford to ignore the present outburst of separatist talk and its significance as an index to unsolved problems of Canadian federalism..."

The reason given by the Commission for omitting the





findings on bilingualism is stated on page 29 of the Glassco Report:

".....even to define clearly what is needed would involve the study of matters lying well outside the terms of reference of the Commission."

This is obviously not the case. The Committee had already settled that question and Commissioner Therrien had this to say:

"In my opinion, the terms of reference of the Commission are not restrictive concerning this aspect of the federal administration; hence the following statement, and my dissent (the only one of the whole vast enquiry) concerning the interpretation of the terms of reference adopted by the Commission."

The key to the answer may lie in Therrien's assertion on page 71 of the Report:

"There is no signal and easy remedy to the federal administration's weakness and shortcomings in the matter of bilingualism. The administration itself does not even realize its own weaknesses and shortcomings, nor will it fully admit that they exist. It does not avail itself of the means at its disposal to find solutions of immediate or long term benefit."

By July of 1961, the Committee on Bilingualism had established to its members' satisfaction, the relevance of bilingualism to the terms of reference. The investigation was begun, and continued to the end of February, 1962. During that time, the situation in the various government departments and agencies became clear. What this situation was, in fact, may be seen in a part of the Commission report, beginning on page 67. A more detailed resumé of



situation is found on pp. 75-8. No recommendation, save that on page 29, is given.

Commissioner Therrien described the general picture in this way, on page 69:

"It is practically impossible to obtain precise statistics of the number of French Canadians employed in the civil service and the number of bilingual public servants; yet statistics on alcoholism in the public service are readily available."

Thus the relative importance accorded the problem is indicated.

"The use of the French language as a medium of communication within departments and agencies depends largely on the number of French-speaking public servants. The number of French-speaking public servants is very limited. The view that such a state of affairs is regrettable has been expressed not only by French Canadians, but also in many English Canadian quarters. Of 5,000 public servants in receipt of an annual salary of more than \$8,000..... less than 600 are French-speaking Canadians... In eleven departments, only six of the 103 civil servants receiving \$14,000 a year or more are French Canadians."

"The number of French Canadians holding key positions in the government administration is insignificant, save for a few district offices in the Province of Quebec. In several key departments, not a single high official is French-speaking."

"In the federal administration, and markedly in the armed Forces, there is little or no understanding of French Canada's claim to certain rights, especially with regard to the co-existence of the French language in Canada, nor of the way in which bilingualism bears upon the efficiency in the administration."





"In the Army, certain so-called bilingual courses given in Quebec.....are not only an instrument of assimilation, but also to an even greater extent, a means of debasing the French language."



### The Government's Attitude

What was the Government's attitude toward the problem? By issuing no stated policies toward bilingualism and biculturalism in the terms of reference, it allowed Commissioner Glassco to discourage and finally forbid altogether the publication of the studies made by the Committee. In this move he was opposed by a single Commissioner, two junior French-speaking staff member, and two English-speaking staff members, to no effect.

For Glassco, the problem offered no ambiguities: bilingualism and representation bore no relation to a study of efficiency in administration. In vain did Commissioner Therrien insist, in a minority report: (68)

"The terms of reference of the Commission should, in my opinion, have led to more specific and detailed conclusions and recommendations concerning the incidence of bilingualism in relation to the efficiency and economy in the federal administration."

Once again the traditional views of efficiency had won over representation and all that it implied.



## CURRENT ATMOSPHERE AND ACTIVITY

To date, according to other reports from this Commission, there is not a great deal of support for bilingual and bicultural programs. The traditional goal of increased efficiency in using resources prevails over other values. Bilingualism and biculturalism form a kind of problem which differs markedly from other problems that have faced the bureaucracy in the past. They are not a problem which will be completely resolved by the bureaucracy's traditional principles of consistency, impersonality, and specialization. The current attitude towards bilingualism and biculturalism seems to be positive, insofar as providing increased bilingual service is concerned. What is not taken into consideration is the idea that the actual work conditions for French Canadians in the service, must be changed. Any drastic change in the real style of administration would find an atmosphere less than receptive.

At present, there is far more awareness of the problem of bilingualism and biculturalism than there has ever been, and there is also much concern expressed at top levels of the service for it. So far, the appropriate agency for initiating programs has not been agreed upon but may well prove to be the newly established Special Secretariat attached to the Privy Council.





As other reports of the Commission point out, the old conflict between a narrow interpretation of efficiency, and representation still continues. The Action Research Group found that any suggestion which tended to favour bilingual employees over unilingual ones were immediately perceived as interfering with the merit principle, the foundation for efficiency in the Canadian public service. Merit is commonly conceived as expertise in this context. Any reform of recruitment procedures to provide better representation for the French-speaking group is seen as incompatible with merit and efficiency. The present atmosphere is the outcome of many years of this conflict.



### Agencies of Change

Professor Franks in his report on Treasury Board, also sees the present situation in terms of this conflict. On page 52 of his report, he states:

".....the goals of efficiency and consistency can conflict with other goals, such as representation and bilingualism..."

He also sees the bureaucracy facing a problem unlike previous ones: (p. 59):

".....to create a truly bilingual public service, drastic changes will be needed....."

He points out that these will be unlikely to occur as long as the upper levels of the public service are predominantly English-speaking. Thus, a vicious circle is set in motion: measures to establish better representation at responsible levels will receive little support until better representation is established.

Treasury Board is now the most powerful agency of the federal bureaucracy. It is significant that it has not included bilingualism as one of the goals in its present program of reforms. The two essential elements for its inclusion are still lacking: a timetable for the gradual solution of bilingual and bicultural problems, and strong support at the political level for such programs. We may well wonder with Professor Franks, why Parliament's demands in this area have not been greater.





That the ethnic pattern in the present administration is a long standing one, he realized, and asserts (p. 76)

".....even before confederation the pressures toward making the public service predominantly English-speaking were at work....."

Nor is he hopeful about the outcome of the conflict: (43)

".....The criterion of bilingualism so far has not been considered directly relevant to the goals of efficiency and effectiveness towards which the Treasury Board in the near future taking a larger hand in developing government policy towards bilingualism in the public service."

The reasons he gives for such a prediction could be extended to include the public service as a whole: 1) the clientele of the Secretariat is largely English-speaking; 2) the Minister in charge of Treasury Board does not demand action on the problem; 3) the French Canadians on Treasury Board do not make up a significant pressure group.



### The Civil Service Commission

More initiative for the problem of bilingualism has come from the Civil Service Commission. (See "Historical Background" by Hillel Steiner.) In April of 1962, a new statement of policy was issued, which gave the Civil Service Commission "discretion to judge to what extent knowledge of the English language or the French language or both, is required in any government department or office to perform its functions adequately and to give effective service to the public." (MOB 8, Ottawa, April 2)

The Civil Service Commission legislation has the goal of bilingual service (of good quality) to the public. No hint of drastic changes in either recruitment or promotional procedures is given. There has yet been no statement concerning a broader base for recruitment, with appropriate training after entry.



The Prime Minister's speech: (House of Commons Debates,  
April 6)

The agency designated to carry out the government's new policy on bilingualism is the Special Secretariat on Bilingualism, to work in cooperation with the Civil Service Commission, Treasury Board, and all Deputy Ministers and heads of agencies. The government's policy is still a little vague, especially about the measures to achieve its stated goal. Bilingualism, or the willingness to acquire it, is to be considered as an element of merit for a position adjudged to need such a skill. With this goes the promise of more and better language training after entry. Other innovations are bonuses in clerical ranks to bilingual positions.

No measures have been suggested to weight the balance between English and French in the public service more equally. No measures have yet been taken to equalize the status of the French language in relation to the English language in communication within the service. What the Special Secretariat will do, and what kind of support it will receive for its programs is not clear. The employees' associations can be expected to work against any program for greatly increased bilingualism in the service, especially in the upper levels.





Mr. Pearson's stated goal that "within a reasonable period of years a state of affairs in the public service will be reached whereby it will be normal practice for oral or written communications within the service to be made in either official language at the option of the person making them, in the knowledge that they will be understood by those directly concerned," is optimistic, in view of the fact that the measures suggested are not adequate to accomplish such a goal.



General Atmosphere among Public Servants.

The Career Studies have indicated that francophones feel generally pessimistic about the future of bilingualism and biculturalism in the public service, both generally, and in direct relation to their work situation.

On the whole the attitude among anglophone public servants is apathetic, even wary.. The predominant feeling is worry about bilingualism - lest it take precedence over job-training or ability.





## CONCLUSION

Since 1853 the French-speaking population in Canada has stated its desire for better representation in the Federal Public Service. At different times, individuals such as Ernest Lapointe, and groups, such as the Committee of Five, sought better representation. If newspaper accounts are to be credited, the latter did obtain some appointments by special efforts to bring pressure on the government. At no time did any of these efforts result in clear policy by the government toward the questions of bilingualism and representation. The statement of the Prime Minister in April of this year is the first of its kind.

For over 100 years, a traditionally English-speaking administration has remained consistent in its patterns of recruitment and promotion at the expense of representation for the French-speaking group, and service of equal quality in the two official languages of Canada. The principle of efficiency, (the increased utilization of resources), and merit, (expertise), have operated at the expense of other values, even when these stood for the promotion of national unity.

Efforts to obtain information on special efforts to bring up representation on the French side from interviews



with senior public servants were, on the whole, unsuccessful. The people most closely involved in such efforts tended to be the most uncommunicative. Powerful figures in Canadian administration and politics such as King, Howe, Glassco, all displayed indifference to the problem of bilingualism and biculturalism. Pressure groups seeking an administration which could be equally responsive to the needs and interests of both charter groups in Canada, have been unsuccessful in obtaining specific measures to make such responsiveness possible. The apparent conflict between efficiency and representation has never been re-interpreted, or resolved.



## Appendix A

Document 1: "Suggestions pour refréner la tyrannie bureaucratique dans le service public" by Ernest Lapointe

### 1. Experts techniques

"La création au Conseil de la Trésorerie, de trois positions soustraites à l'application de la Loi du service civil quant à la nomination des titulaires, et comportant un salaire au moins égal à celui de l'organisateur en chef de la Commission du Service Civil.

La Commission du service civil, par ses organisateurs, doit faire chaque année (paragraphe e, article 4) un rapport sur l'organisation et le personnel, y compris les fonctions et les traitements du personnel dans chaque partie du service civil. La fonction des trois experts serait de faire ce relevé annuel avec l'aide d'un organisateur de la Commission du service civil, et le sous-ministre du département concerné. Souventefois, il a été constaté que dans ces réorganisations, des positions étaient devenues plus importantes du fait qu'on y avait ajouté de nouveaux devoirs ou de nouvelles responsabilités; par contre, d'autres avaient diminué d'importance. Les titulaires de ces différentes positions étaient réclassifiés selon leur importance: d'où il suit que les chefs de services pouvaient, à leur gré, et sans prendre en considération l'ancienneté de l'employé, favoriser certaines personnes et laisser en plan d'autres employés





qui remplissaient très bien leur devoir, mais qui, pour certaines raisons, ne plaisaient pas tant aux chefs que ceux qu'ils voyaient favoriser.

Les pouvoirs de ces nouveaux experts seraient tels qu'ils pourraient dérouter les manoeuvres injustes de ces chefs bureaucratiques. L'un des trois serait un Canadien français, et les deux autres devraient être des hommes reconnus pour leur largeur de vue.

## 2. Examineurs du service civil

Rétablissement de la section française de la division des examinateurs du service civil, ayant à sa direction un adjoint de l'examineur en chef.

Conférences interuniversitaires pour établir l'équivalence, des degrés accordés dans les différentes provinces, et pour déterminer l'importance de la spécialisation dans les services techniques. Les délégués universitaires devraient s'inspirer des directives données par l'université Harvard, qui déplore une spécialisation à outrance chez les étudiants qui n'ont pas reçu une culture générale suffisante. Dans le choix des candidats aux positions du service public au Canada, cette surspécialisation a été une cause d'élimination d'hommes de valeur et d'entrée au service d'employés à vision étroite, qui purent très bien faire un travail de



routine, mais dont les connaissances générales sont souvent insuffisantes pour résoudre des problèmes nouveaux. Aux Etats-Unis, plusieurs grandes industries annoncent que les postulants à leurs positions techniques ou scientifiques ne devront pas être des spécialistes, mais des hommes ayant une solide culture générale, et qui pourraient se spécialiser, en un court espace de temps, dans tous leurs services. On pourrait aussi, à cette conférence, adopter un programme à peu près uniforme pour diriger plus spécialement les jeunes gens vers les charges publiques.

### 3. Sous-comité du gouvernement

Nomination d'un sous-comité du Gouvernement, composé d'un ministre et de deux députés pour faire une étude de toutes les positions de service, de Victoria à Halifax, en vue de recommander la classification de ces positions selon le langage du peuple que les employés seront appelés à servir. Il y aurait des positions unilingues anglaises, d'autres unilingues françaises et d'autres bilingues. Un Canadien français ferait évidemment partie de ce sous-comité. Rien, cependant, n'empêcherait le titulaire d'une de ces positions ainsi classifiées de concourir pour une promotion s'il est, par ailleurs, apte à remplir les fonctions de l'emploi qu'il postulera. Il n'y a aucun doute que cette classification, basée sur la connaissance des langues, pourra





varier de temps à autre suivant le mouvement démographique."

Lapointe was entirely conscious of the existence of such an animal as the bureaucracy. Since he was also considering means of establishing safeguards for bilingualism within it, he may have seen how the trend towards the efficient bureaucracy was moving away from his aims of representation and bilingualism.

## 2. The Telephone Incident: Language use

In 1937 an exchange of letters went from Lapointe's office to the head of the Civil Service Commission, then Mr. C.H. Bland, following a flood of complaints made to Lapointe, and to his private secretary, Louis-Philippe Picard.

The complaints came mostly from members of Parliament from the province of Quebec, complaining that they could not reach the French-speaking Assistant Secretary of the Civil Service Commission, as nobody in that office answered them in the French language.

Again it appears that Lapointe is the recipient of complaints with regard to the bilingual situation within the public service. This may have been a situation of his own choosing; i.e. that came about through his keen interest in the subject. Certainly at this time Lapointe was not the



always inclined to think that he exaggerates and that fair play and broadmindedness has its place in the Commission as it should have in all other Departments of the Government.

However, complaints have been made to me lately that when calling the French Assistant Secretary of the Commission and that when he is away, nobody in the office can answer the call in the French language. Personally, not believing that this could be true, I called Mr. Thivierge this afternoon, at 3 o'clock. I was answered, in English, that Mr. Thivierge was away. I insisted to talk in French as you know that many persons from the Province of Quebec do not speak English, and I acted as if I were one of them. I was answered most arrogantly: "You will have to speak English if you want any answer". I then told the lady that I was entitled to have somebody to answer me in French as I was calling the Office of the French Assistant Secretary of the Commission. The lady then told me: "If you insist, I will get a French-speaking person to answer you". I consider that this is most out of place and it justifies many of our Members of Parliament to complain.

Personally, I do not have to suffer from such an occurrence, but a Member of Parliament who is not familiar with English - and you will admit that none is forced to be acquainted with the English language - would be justified in



considering that this is very poor service in a Government organism that is supposed to serve the whole of Canada, even the good old Province of Quebec.

I thought that I had to bring yhis to your personal attention and I am doing it before I even had the occasion to talk to Mr. Thivierge or to Mr. Potvin about it.

During the Period of the Parliamentary sessions, I am in daily contact with all the Members and I know that their feelings are often times incensed about such a question . This is why I consider that the present incident should be brought to your attention, in order that we may restore a better understanding of the Commission's services by our Members.

Private Secretary

L.P. Picard





L.P. Picard then received the following message from  
C.H. Bland:

"In reply to your personal letter of the 25th ultimo,  
I have spoken to Mr. Thivierge with reference to the incident  
to which you refer, and I am sure that there will be no  
difficulty of this nature in future. I may say that one of  
the reasons for the difficulty that does arise is the fact  
that the department has not been able to secure a telephone  
for this particular post."

C.H. Bland

December 2, 1937

C.H. Bland  
Civil Service Commission  
Date December 2, 1932.

"I wish to thank you most sincerely for your letter of  
the 1st instant, answering mine on November 25th, concerning  
the incident which I related to you.

I am glad to learn that there will be no difficulty  
of this nature in the future.

You will admit with me that had the party been more  
polite or more considerate in her answer no ill feeling  
would have happened. It is no crime for an English-Canadian  
not to speak French not any more than it is for a French



Canadian not to speak English, but when both show good will, courteousness and consideration, incidents of that nature are easily avoided.

Thanking you again for your promptness to look into the matter, I am.....etc."

L.P. Picard

L.P. Picard  
Bureau du Ministre  
le 16 décembre, 1937.

"La Commission du service civil a demandé que des téléphones soient installés dans les bureaux de MM. Gilchrist, Nelson et Thivierge. Il est de toute importance que ce dernier ait un téléphone chez lui, de manière à pouvoir répondre en français à tous les renseignements qui lui sont demandés par députés et autres.

Le Contrôleur du Trésor s'oppose à la petite dépense additionnelle de l'installation de ces téléphones. Je vous serais bien obligé si vous parliez au Très Honorable M. Lapointe du téléphone de M. Thivierge, car j'ai eu de nombreuses plaintes verbales de la part des personnes qui s'adressent à ce bureau.

A. Potvin.





A. Potvin  
Commission du Service Civil  
Ottawa

le 17 décembre 1937

"J'ai pris connaissance de votre lettre du 17 courant, concernant l'installation d'un téléphone dans le bureau de M. Thivierge.

Je dois vous dire que M. Lapointe a écrit, aujourd'hui même, au Ministre des Finances lui demandant de faire les représentations voulues auprès du Contrôleur du Trésor. Je ne sais pas s'il y aura moyen d'obtenir cela avant la fin de l'année fiscale car le Contrôleur du Trésor a refusé l'installation d'un nouveau téléphone pour mon assistant, M. Bernier, et bien que nous avons appelé de cette décision auprès du Ministre des Finances, ce dernier a supporté, comme d'habitude, le Contrôleur du Trésor, disant que nous devrions attendre la prochaine année pour obtenir l'appareil.

L.P. Picard

Hon. C.A. Dunning  
Ministre des Finances

December 17, 1937

My dear Colleague,

A request has been made to you by the Civil Service Commission for the installation of new telephones in the offices of certain superior employees of the Commission and it has been opposed by the Comptroller of the Treasury.



I am writing to you concerning the proposed telephone of Mr. Thivierge, French Assistant Secretary, because this matter has already caused trouble to me.

As you are no doubt aware, most of the Members of Parliament for the Province of Quebec use the French language when calling the different Departments. Mr. Thivierge being the Assistant French Secretary of the Commission, they have to deal with him quite often. Up to the moment, considerable trouble has happened and many of these Members have been angered by the fact that they could never get anybody, when calling Mr. Thivierge, who could answer them in French. The trouble is that only one telephone serves the Assistant English Secretary and the Assistant French Secretary; the telephone being in the office of the first mentioned part. To avoid the trouble caused in this regard, the Commission itself has had to ask for separate telephones for the two Assistant Secretaries.

The feelings of many of the Members have been incensed by some of the answers that have been given when calling that particular office and it would help matters very much if you could immediately authorize for a new telephone to be installed in Mr. Thivierge's office.

I am sorry to have to bother you by such a small question, but if you only felt the reactions caused by small





incidents of this nature you would, yourself be very eager to correct things the same way I do, in order to avoid trouble."

The rest of the exchange will be found in the Appendix. The matter was eventually attended to but not until the CS Commission had passed the responsibility to Treasury. Lapointe's efforts met with many frustrations.

C.A. Dunning to E. Lapointe  
Minister of Finance

December 22, 1937

My dear Colleague,

".....I inquired of the Comptroller of the Treasury today what is the situation. He advises me that early in the year, there being no money available, he advised the Commission that all of its applications had to be held up irrespective of their merits, but if facilities become available he would let them know, for inquiry made by him led him to believe that the Civil Service Commission could utilize one or two additional telephones.

On December 9th, a local becoming available, he telephoned to the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission advising him that if he desired to do submit an application for a new local, funds were available. The Chairman stated he would inquire and decide which of their applications was the most pressing. Nothing further has been heard by the





Treasury Office since."

Yours faithfully

to A. Potvin from L.P. Picard

"Pour faire suite à la correspondance que nous avons déjà échangée concernant l'installation d'un téléphone dans le bureau de M. Thivierge, je vous envoie ci-inclus copie d'une lettre que le Ministre a reçue de son collègue, l'honorable M. Dunning, à ce sujet."

to Picard from Potvin

31 décembre 1937

"Je vous remercie sincèrement de la bonne attention que vous avez bien voulue prêter à cette question."

("Another item mentioned in the letter from "Jeunesses Patriotes" was the announcement that M. Ilsley nous qu'il a décidé (en accord avec le Trust du fonctionnarisme) d'envoyer dans notre province douze fonctionnaires qui ne connaissent pas le français.")

### 3. Letters on the subject of French Canadian Representation

On April 13, 1940, J. Oscar Bouchard, the Quebec Minister of Justice wrote to Lapointe about a matter in the Munitions and Supply branch in the province of Quebec,



Lapointe's reply, given through his private secretary, M. Bernier, gives an indication of what the situation was.

"J'ai reçu de nombreuses plaintes depuis quelque temps à l'effet que le Bureau des Approvisionnements de Guerre envoie à Québec pour la surveillance des contrats accordés à des firmes québécoises sont tous des Anglais ne parlant aucunement le français."

"Les candidats canadiens-français qualifiés ne manquent pas et il y a de nombreuses applications faites à la Commission. Une entre autres était faite par monsieur Paul Tremblay...il me ferait plaisir que vous le recommandiez. Je le sais très bien qualifié et il pourra subir l'examen nécessaire et vous m'obligeriez en intervenant de la façon ci-demandée."

On Lapointe's instructions, Mr. Bernier, his private secretary, wrote to the French Assistant at the Civil Service Commission, M. Thivierge on April 7, 1940.

"On ajoute qu'il serait dans l'intérêt public d'avoir des inspecteurs bilingues tout spécialement pour ce qui est des contrats accordés dans la province de Québec ..... Auriez-vous l'obligeance de faire part de ces représentations à qui de droit et de me tenir au courant des développements qui pourraient se produire à ce sujet."





M. Gravel of the Commission des Achats de Guerre at Ottawa then wrote to M. Bernier.

"Je suis sous l'impression que, à moins que le Gouvernement ne donne instruction à tous les sous-ministres et à tous les chefs de département d'employer un pourcentage fixe de canadiens-français, les nôtres ne pourront jamais obtenir les positions auxquelles ils ont droit."

To Mr. Thivierge then was directed the following memorandum from the Chief Examiner and Executive Officer (SGN) May 1, 1940.

"In connection with the attached letter of Mr. Bernier, I have enquired of Mr. Neills, Head of the Inspection Division, National Defence, as to whether due regard has been had to the necessity of observing the language requirements in connection with the employment of Inspectors on leather and boots in the Province of Quebec. He advises me that the Department has not overlooked this requirement, and that pains have been taken to see that bilingual Inspectors are assigned to factories where such appointments appear to be required. In the absence of specific complaints is there any necessity for looking into the matter further?"



#### 4. The St. Malo Shops: Efficiency

On June 10, Lapointe replied to Howe on this matter of the St. Malo shops:

"I quite agree with you that in special circumstances, when speed is required, it would not be practical to call for tenders. But I strongly claim that the contract would then be given to local contractors. It is almost an insult to the numerous important contracting firms of Quebec City and district to employ Anglin-Norcross for works in Quebec City. I must confess that I am in entire sympathy with the Quebec contractors in their indignation with regards to the treatment they are receiving. Of course, they are inclined to think that it is because they have French names and are not special friends of those in charge of the operations. I earnestly believe that this kind of action will lead to great troubles. Is there still time to remedy this special difficulty?"

However, Lapointe afterward found himself in disagreement with Howe over matters relating to Quebec. The following exchange illustrates one instance where this disagreement is evident.

In a letter from Lapointe to Howe, of June 7, 1940 Lapointe remarks:

"I understand that big construction works are being



undertaken to enlarge the St. Malo ships, and the Valcartier Arsenal, and there is a report that those contracts will be given to Montreal firms without tender.

I cannot see anything that would create disturbance and trouble more than such action if it is going to be taken. There are many responsible firms of contractors in Quebec City and districts, and surely this work should be given to them. Of course, I fear that the absence of officers in the Department who are acquainted with the conditions in Quebec is responsible for the difficulties we are meeting in that respect."

On the following day a reply came from Howe:

".....In ordinary times, the proper procedure would have been to first prepare the plans and specifications and then to call for tenders for the work, but, as this would have involved a delay of eight or ten weeks, the exigences of the situation seemed to indicate a difference procedure. (Here he indicated that the firm of Anglin-Norcross had already been asked to do the job, and had been working on the plans for several weeks).

5. Lapointe's Investigation of representation and bi-lingualism in the government departments

In response to a request for better bilingual service in the departments, on April 1st, 1939, Corbin, the





Secretary of State, sent a memorandum to Lapointe, obviously proud of the bilingual situation in the departments under his jurisdiction. (See Appendix)

Etat comparatif des employés de langue anglaise et de langue française dans les départements qui sont sous la juridiction du Secrétaire d'Etat. 1<sup>er</sup> avril, 1939.

<u>Département</u>	<u>Chef</u>	<u>Langue anglaise</u>	<u>Langue française</u>
Secrétariat d'état	E.H. Coleman	172	164
Archives Publiques	Gustave Lanctôt	33	34
Bureau de Directeur général des élections	Jules Castonguay	6	10
Bureau du Gardien des Biens Ennemis	A.H. Mathieu	3	1
Imprimerie Nationale	J.O. Patenaude	293	304
Surintendant des Faillites	W.J. Reilly	8	5
Bureau du Ministre		1	55

Le 30 août, 1939

Grand total	516	523
Total de tous les employés		1,039
P.C. de langue française		.50.52
P.C. de langue anglaise		.49.48
F.C. (Fernand Corbin)		

Since it was among information sought by Lapointe from



various Public Service departments with a view to assessing the bilingual and bicultural situation in each.

"The Department of Public Works is one of the major Departments of the Government, and from Confederation until 1904 it had French Ministers, and was predominantly French in character.

From 1904 until 1935 it had English Ministers and gradually became English.

Since 1908 Mr. J.B. Hunter has been the Deputy Minister. He is 61 years of age, has a salary of \$10,000, has been permanent since 1900, a period of thirty seven years, and would receive full superannuation of \$7,000 per annum if retired. Mr. Hunter, being an English Protestant, has never been very favourable to the Catholics and more particularly to the French Catholics in the Department. His power and influence gradually increased in the Department until it reached its maximum during the tenure of office of Honourable J.C. Elliott as Minister of Public Works from 1926 to 1930. Mr. Elliott was a school boy companion of Mr. Hunter, and the latter was given unlimited power by Mr. Elliott during his regime.

During Mr. Elliott's regime Mr. Hunter built up an organization in the Department of his particular Protestant favourites composed of T.W. Fuller as Chief Architect,





K.M. Cameron as Chief Engineer, and W.P. Harrell as Private Secretary to the Minister. This "clique" ran the Department and is still doing so, although Fuller has been retired as Chief Architect, but in his place has been appointed Mr. Charles D. Sutherland, another appointee and particular friend of Mr. Hunter.

Cameron, Fuller, Sutherland and Harrell have always been mere rubber stamps for Mr. Hunter, and they are still operating in this capacity. They are all Protestants and no Catholic has any chance of betterment if this Protestant organization does not desire it.

In the case of Cameron, the Chief Engineer, it maybe stated that he comes from the same district in Western Ontario as Hunter, and that Sutherland and Harrell are members of Chalmers Church to which Hunter belongs.

In Harrell's case it must be said that he was a private secretary to Honourable H.H. Stevens prior to his entry into the Department of Public Works in 1912.

This Protestant organization has been in absolute control of the Department since Honourable Mr. Elliott's administration in 1926. Even today it works secretly but effectively in spite of the fact that Honourable Mr. P.J.A. Cardin is Minister, and the one and only solution to alter



this condition is to retire Mr. Hunter a \$7,000 per annum and to replace him as Deputy Minister by a Roman Catholic.

Further more, it may be pointed out that in the reorganization and amalgamations of the various departments during the past year not one major position was given to a Roman Catholic or a French Canadian."

Another memorandum follows this last, also unsigned and undated, with a hand printed date at the bottom. I do not venture to suggest the author, the fact that this memorandum is filled with the Lapointe papers would seem to indicate that he was often the recipient of such representations, and that his interest in questions concerning bilingualism and ethnicity were well-known.

Hon. C.D. Howe to Hon. Ernest Lapointe

Personal.

May 8th, 1941.

"Your letter of the 7th instant, with reference to this Department's Purchasing Officer at Quebec, has been received.

I think I have made my attitude clear with relation to this position. I have always been anxious to appoint a French Canadian, realizing how important it is that our Purchasing Agent at Quebec should speak French. However, I have been equally insistent that this officer should be



experienced in the business of purchasing. The two previous occupants failed to meet these requirements and as the Minister responsible I had no alternative. I will be happy to appoint a French Canadian if the person with the right qualifications can be found.

Yours faithfully,

C.D. Howe

Hon. E. Lapointe to Hon. C.D. Howe

May 9th, 1941.

Re: Department's Purchasing Agent, Quebec

I have just received your letter.

I am sorry, but I cannot but feel that the chiefs of that Branch wanted their own man there. Of course, you as well as myself realize that out of over three million French Canadians it is possible to find one who is competent in the business of purchasing. The first essential requirement to meet the difficulty is good will.

In August 1930 the following French Canadians held the post or rank of Deputy-Ministers:

1. Auditor-General..... Gonthier
2. Chief Electoral Officer..... Castonguay
3. Civil Service Commissioner..... Tremblay
4. Clerk of the House of Commons..... Beauchesne





5. Joint Librarian, Library of.....Taché  
Parliament
6. National Defence ..... Desbarats
7. Clerk of the Privy Council ..... Lemaire
8. Deputy Postmaster General ..... Gaboury
9. Canadian Mounted Police..... Col. Starnes
10. Patent and Copyright ..... T.S. Richard

Now only the following French-Canadians have rank of  
Deputy Ministers:

1. Auditor-General ..... Gonthier
2. Chief Electoral Officer ..... Castonguay
3. Clerk of the House of Commons ..... Beauchesne
4. Clerk of the Privy Council ..... Lemaire
5. Civil Service Commissioner ..... Potvin
6. Joint Librarian, Library of..... Desrochers  
Parliament
7. National Defence ..... Lafleche
8. King's Printer ..... Patenaude

Page 2: Quebec Share of Principal Offices

Departmental Heads .....	(total) 34	French Canadians 8
Chairmen and Heads of Commissions..	22	0
Assistant-Deputy-Ministers .....	26	3

---

82

---

11

Ration entitled to 23 instead of 11

Total shortage .....12



The hand written note of the bottom is printed:

"In the Department of Mines and Natural Resources 1 Deputy Minister and 5 Directors have been appointed and 37 promotions granted, without naming the French Canadian, ignoring highly qualified and experienced officers like Dr. Marius Barbeau, ethnologist, with 25 years service, and Dr. Poitevin, mineralogist, with 24 years service."

## 6. Bilingual Legislation

### Lapointe and the Bilingual Situation in the Service

Lapointe's interest in bilingualism in all its aspects is again evident in this item found among his memoranda: a marked copy of the Civil Service Regulations of 1927, open at chapter 7, "the Act to amend the Civil Service Act", April 7th, 1938. This refers to part of what was called the Lacroix bill. The sections underlined concerned the Civil Service Competitions examinations and language requirements. The Lacroix Bill states:

"Except where otherwise expressly provided, all appointments to the Civil Service shall be upon competitive examination under and pursuant to the provision of this Act, and shall be during pleasure: Provided that no appointment, whether permanent or temporary shall be made within a province, and no employee shall be transferred from a position in a province to a local position in the same or another province, whether permanent or temporary until and unless the candidate or employee was qualified, by





examination, on the knowledge and use of the language of the majority of the persons with whom he is required to do business: provided that such language shall be the French or the English language."

Bilingualism as a requirement for employment.

Following this marked copy of the Civil Service Regulations appears an unsigned and undated memorandum. The date of this memorandum is probably 1940. Its subject is bilingualism as a requirement for employment within the Public Service, and it refers, in part, to the Department of Munitions and Supply, which, at least until January 1st, 1940, had no French Canadians in its employ. Lapointe was intensely concerned about the legislative aspects of bilingualism. (See Appendix)

"If an appointment is required in a locality where both English and French are spoken, and the deputy head of the department in which the appointment is to be made advises the Commission that a knowledge of both English and French is required for the proper performance of its duties, the Commission shall appoint to the position a person who possesses such qualifications.

1. In practically all cases where bilingual employees were appointed when the language requirement was English only, they were certified in lower clerical positions Grade 1 and 2 by the Civil Service Commission, in order of merit from the eligible lists duly established by competitive



examinations, and those certified were considered for employment and accepted by the Department only after it had been determined that they possessed an adequate knowledge of English.

So far as higher clerical, technical, professional and special positions are concerned, the enclosed list of appointments made in the Department of Munition and Supply for duty in Ottawa since January 1st, 1940, is self-explanatory.

2. No one will go so far as to request or even suggest that all requisitions should call for bilingual employees; now and then, however, one or two, especially in the higher classes, would not, in my opinion, be entirely out of place.

3. I am informed and I can also state from my own observation that, with very few exceptions, all appointments, outside of the lower clerical and stenographic positions, are made and certified by the Commission on the recommendation of the Department, and when no recommendations are made and names are submitted by the Commission, the Department generally, if not always, decides who should be certified.

4. The enclosed list will readily show that although the present practice is not altogether exclusive, it is much less inclusive in so far as French-speaking or





bilingual candidates are concerned."

With this memorandum is a copy of Civil Service Commission form 60-25M-7-40, entitled "Government of Canada, Requisition for Appointment", with the following parts marked:

"Place of Work.

I certify that the language of the persons with whom the incumbent of this position will be required to do business is ..... (English or French)

A knowledge of both English and French..... required for this

(Is or is not) position."

From the time of the passing of the Lacroix bill, there was a good deal of debate between Lapointe and Howe, on Civil Service legislation concerning bilingualism. Lapointe obtained an interpretation from the French Assistant at the Civil Service Commission, and used it to criticize Howe's requisition procedures in the Department of Munitions and Supply. (See Appendix)

## 7. The incident of Jeunesses Patriotes

Picard, on June 15, 1936 answered Denis non-committally: ".....Quant à la lettre signée par Mr. Howe, je désire vous





informer que M. Lapointe a fait des représentations personnelles à son collègue au sujet de cette traduction et je crois pouvoir vous affirmer qu'il y aura amélioration de ce côté."

Such "représentations" were expressed in Lapointe's own letter to Mr. Howe in June 22nd.

The honorable C.D. Howe, Minister of Marine, Ottawa, Ontario.

My dear colleague:

I am in receipt of a letter from the "Jeunesses Patriotes de Montréal", the text of which has been widely published also in the newspapers of the Province of Quebec.

Part of it deals with a letter which you wrote to these young men on the 28th of April, first copy of which is attached to my letter.

I agree with them that this translation of an English text is horrible, and doubt very much that it has been made by a competent member of the Bureau of Translations.

I thought it advisable to bring the matter to your attention."

The answer to this letter on June 25 from Bennet, Howe's private secretary, came marked personal, and was in English:



".....Some days ago an official of the Department brought this matter to the attention of the Minister. Since that time we have made rather extensive enquiries as to the source of the trouble. The particular letter referred to was dictated in this office and translated into French by our translation branch. It goes without saying that this branch of the service is in need of reorganization.

However, Mr. Howe does not feel it advisable to make the required changes until the amalgamation of the Departments takes place. In the meantime, I have suitable arrangements for the translation of Mr. Howe's correspondence."...  
(See Appendix)

8. Replies to Lapointe's request for better representation

Replies re Lapointe's letter to King ( requesting representation on special boards and commissions )

Reply from Norman Rogers to Lapointe

December 11, 1959.

My dear Colleague:

".....On the subject of appointments of French Canadians to the various commissions which have been established since the outbreak of war, I agree with you that very great care should be exercised in the electing of personnel for these commissions so that there may be fair representation of





French Canadians on these boards.

".....I can assure that I will do whatever I can do to redress any wrong which may have been done inadvertently during the past few weeks."

The Under Secretary of State, Renan, also replied to Lapointe, on December 9th, 1939.

As I mentioned to you in our conversation last week, I think it will be found that in the special war services and agencies under the control of this Department the balance has been kept quite even. There is, however, one circumstance which might be kept in mind. In several of the branches there are employees who are French speaking Canadians but whose names do not indicate the fact. If the survey which has been conducted, therefore, is based entirely on the names, it may be inaccurate in some small percentage.

You may be assured, however, that in connection with any development which may take place in this Department, the senior officers of the Department are very ready to see that the important consideration you mention is kept prominently in mind.

I am, with great respect,"

Revenue Minister Ilsley replied on December 11th.



"I wholly agree with you that the situation described should not continue and should be corrected...."

From        Howe came this assurance on December 11:

"I can assure you that I shall do what is possible to see that a more equitable distribution is made."

The Minister of Labour wrote on December 9, 1939 citing an editorial in L'Action Catholique which stated:

"Out of fourteen press liaison officers in different departments, not a single one of the French language."

"I appreciate very much your having called this matter to my attention, as nothing could be more inimical than the mistake that was made in the last war, especially at a time when we are receiving such splendid cooperation from the new government in Quebec."

Replies were also received from the Minister of Pensions and National Health, and from the Minister of Agriculture (December 9).

On the subject of the same editorial the Minister of Labour wrote again on December 22nd, 1939.

"I think it is of extreme importance that this situation should be rectified." and ".....I believe that every press release should be given simultaneously in French as well as in English. I have arranged that this shall become in this Department and I believe it would be desirable that it should



be done in all Departments."

9. Requests to Lapointe for better representation.

On the subject of representation, the Saint-Jean-Baptiste Society wrote to Lapointe on January 5, 1936:

To Lapointe

From The Saint-Jean Baptiste Society, of Saint-Boniface,  
January 5, 1936.

1. "Que des employés bilingues soient nommés dans les divers services fédéraux.
2. Qu'il est de notoriété publique que le groupe français de Manitoba, loin d'avoir une part équitable dans les services publics, n'a pas un seul membre au bureau de l'impôt sur le Revenu; n'en a qu'une couple aux Douanes; et qu'un petit groupe nommé aux Postes il y a sept ou huit ans, est resté dans une position d'infériorité, dans le service auxiliaire. Et la situation est la même ou encore plus défavorable dans les autres bureaux." and..."...chaque fois qu'un poste est laissé vacant par l'un des nôtres, on le donne à quelqu'un d'une autre langue." Lapointe answered their letter





Appendix BReference to the Problem that Concerned the Committee  
and the Jean investigation in Hansard.

May 20, 1947 (House of Commons Debates)

M. Roland Beaudry: (St. James) (Member of the Committee of  
Finance)

"I would submit to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Abbott) that his purpose would be achieved in part if he would bend some of his efforts toward obtaining for Canadians of the French language more adequate representation in what constitutes the greener pastures of the civil service - the higher brackets financially and executively. To him and other members of the Cabinet, I would point out that the assurance of better things to come would have undoubted influence over my compatriot of the French language in keeping them at home."

\* \* \* \* \*

May 21, 1947.

M. Hamel (St.-Maurice-Laflèche)

"Now, Mr. Speaker, what about the dominion civil service? With respect to the French-speaking element, the situation in that sphere is such that, as my honourable friends will no doubt admit, since I presume they are honest, and sincere, it threatens to shower ridicule upon all members of the federal house."



"According to the 1941 census, the French minority represents 30.27% of the whole population, while the proportion of French-speaking employees did not exceed 12.25%. I do not hesitate to say that the government is thus depriving the French-speaking population of some 30 to 40 million dollars, and of some 20,000 employment opportunities. This state of things caused such a commotion in the province of Quebec, that a public and independent organization such as the Montreal Chamber of Commerce, fully realizing that this intolerable situation threatened good understanding and national unity, felt duty bound to submit a report to the Gordon Commission.

\* \* \* \* \*

"...There is not one French-speaking deputy minister in twenty-two; this has been unheard of since Confederation. Yet it is claimed up and down the province that the Prime Minister, who is responsible for these appointments is the friend of the French Canadian. The joke has worn threadbare"

\* \* \* \* \*

July 3, 1947      5020      5021

M. René Hamel (in French)

"In the first place, I wish to point out the status of French Canadians in the civil service..."





"The 1941 census, volume 14-4, gives the populations as follows:

Total:	11,506,655
English:	2,968,402
French:	3,483,038
Irish:	1,267,702
Scottish:	1,403,974

Two facts are apparent from those figures - first, that the French-speaking population constitutes the largest ethnical and homogeneous group in the country; second, French-speaking citizens represent over 30% of the total population of Canada. With those figures in mind, let us see what is the proportion of French-speaking persons in the civil service. Two sources of information are available for this purpose. The report of the Montreal Chamber of Commerce, which was submitted to the Gordon Commission, and to the members of the Cabinet, and a statement of the so-called "Committee of Five" which appeared last week in the Journal."

\* \* \* \* \*

House of Commons Debates, July 7, 1947, PP. 5181, 5182.

Mr. Hamel

When speaking on the resolution, I showed, Mr. Chairman, that the French-speaking element makes up 30 per cent of our population and I mentioned that its representation in the civil service was considerably below that percentage. I proved that



in the civil service as a whole that percentage was very low. I wished to give certain details, but I was not permitted to do so. I believe that it would be appropriate to give them now.

If we examine the various departments, from the first to the last, we find a shocking injustice in all ranks of civil servants. For example, out of twenty-two deputy ministers not one is a French Canadian. The Montreal Chamber of Commerce made a complete investigation of the matter and drew up a very interesting table showing the proportion of French Canadians in the civil service, according to certain classifications. For example in the \$8,000 yearly salary bracket and over, they note that the percentage of French Canadians is only 12.3 per cent, while the percentage of the French-speaking element makes up 30 per cent of the total population. Among employees earning \$6,000 and over per annum, 8.12 represents the percentage of French Canadians, while among civil servants whose yearly salary is fixed at \$4,000 and over, the proportion of French-speaking citizens is estimated at 9.52 per cent. In the class earning a yearly salary of \$3,000 and over, the percentage comes to 11.39 per cent while at the level of \$2,400 and over per annum, which includes the largest number of ordinary employees, the proportion is found to be 12.25 per cent.



Obviously, Mr. Chairman, French-speaking Canadians are not given their fair share of employment in the civil service. Why? It is claimed at times that they are not sufficiently qualified and that the reason why French Canadians do not have as much opportunity for promotion in the civil service is that they lack the required ability. Such an argument is not only extremely humiliating, but it is also ridiculous. First, what is meant by ability should be determined. How are qualifications decided upon? I find, for instance, that an ambassador was appointed deputy minister of mines. In what manner does an ambassador's post lead to that of deputy minister of mines? On the other hand, the deputy minister of national revenue, a tax collector, has been elevated to the rank of ambassador. On what basis does the civil service commission judge ability?

Now, that argument may be open to question. It would be another matter if this unfairness towards French Canadians affected only a small number of employees from whom specialized scientific knowledge would be required; but that is not so, Mr. Speaker. Discrimination, as I have shown earlier, is found all along the line, in every department and in every branch. Now, it must further be assumed that in selecting French-speaking candidates the Civil Service Commission eagerly seeks those who offer the very least in the way of future possibilities. Further, it is ridiculous to claim





among three and one half million French Canadians, sufficiently qualified personnel required to fill even the \$2,400 posts cannot be found. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, the ability factor does not come into play.

What does all this bring about? I have shown that because of this discrimination towards French Canadians, my French-speaking fellow-citizens lose \$30 to \$40 million per annum. If you add to that, Mr. Chairman, the fact that about 40 million dollars are now being lost every year as a result of tax agreements between the dominion and the provinces, you will see that French-speaking Canadians will lose about 70 million dollars each year.

Some are wondering why disunion exists in this country. Good will pilgrimages are organized across Canada. Other provinces are told, for instance, that the reason why there is not understanding is that our schools are teaching that the deportation of Acadians occurred in 1755. I say that if there is disunion in this country it is not because our schools are teaching that the Acadians were deported in 1755, but rather because in 1947, and especially since 1919, the deportation of French Canadians from the civil service is going on systematically. That is the true cause of misunderstanding in this country.

Mr. Caouette

Hear, Hear.



Mr. Hamel

Who are those responsible for that situation, Mr. Chairman? I notice the French representation in the civil service has sharply decreased especially since the creation of the Civil Service Commission. The Chambre de Commerce of Montreal, which gives us most interesting facts, shows for instance that in 1918 before the Civil Service Commission as it now exists came into being our proportion was much greater than it is now. As regards the total number of positions in the country, our proportion was then 21.58 per cent, while it is now 12.25 per cent.

The downward trend has been particularly noticeable since the establishment of the Civil Service Commission. Is that body responsible for such a state of affairs? I believe, Mr. Chairman, that it is not the only one to blame. However, it has its share of responsibility for the following reasons: first, it has given its approval to the so-called "made-to-measure requisitions" which have been so much ridiculed. A deputy minister or the head of a department wishes to have Mr. So-and-So appointed; he sets out himself the required qualifications and does so in such a way that only one person can meet the requirements, namely the one who has been chosen in advance and who quite often is already filling the position. Secondly, the responsibility of the Civil Service





Commission comes from the obligations it has under the act. The Civil Service Act places upon the commission, among others, the following duty:

Of its own motion to investigate and report upon the operation of this act and upon the violation of any of the provisions hereof or of any regulation made hereunder; and, upon the request of the head of a department, to investigate and report upon any matter relative to the department, its officers, clerks and other employees.

And besides:

To report upon the organization or proposed organization of ~~the~~ departments or any portion of any department or of the civil service, and upon any proposed change in such organization;

I respectfully submit, Mr. Chairman, that this clause of the Civil Service Act entrusts the commission with the duty to see that, in the civil service, the fundamental principle of our democracy "representation by population" is adhered to. The civil service commission has failed to do that and therefore bears full responsibility in the matter.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what reforms are indicated? I wonder whether the Civil Service Commission is capable of making them. The first reform is to demand of every federal employee whose jurisdiction extends to the whole country that he be perfectly bilingual. What would be the result, I ask all hon. members of this House, if at a certain time one of them wishing to speak to the timber controller, for example,



were to get the following answer: "I am sorry but I cannot speak English". What could be the result of such a situation. If it is preposterous in the eyes of the English-speaking members, I respectfully submit that it is just as preposterous for French-speaking members.

\* \* \* \* \*

House of Commons Debates, July 7, 1947, P. 5183.

Mr. Chairman, we are being told at times that, according to a school of thought now taking shape in the province of Quebec, the federal government is considered somewhat as a foreign government. It may be true. But who is to blame?

Take for instance the case of some constituent of mine who, coming to Ottawa and calling at various departments, finds that officials are exclusively English-speaking.

Here are a few instances: Veterans Affairs, out of four officials paid \$8,000 or more, none are French-speaking. At the Department of Agriculture, out of five officials getting \$8,000 or more, none are are French-speaking. At the Department of Insurance, none. At the Auditor General's, none. At the Department of Commerce, none; at the Mutual Aid Board, none; at the Civil Service Commission, among those paid \$8,000 or more yearly, none. I know there is a French-speaking commissioner, but he does get less than \$8,000. At the National





Research Council, none; at the Privy Council, none; at National Defence, out of four officials who get \$8,000 or more, none are French-speaking. At the Department of Finance, out of four officials receiving a yearly salary of \$8,000 or more, none are French-speaking. At the Governor General's, none; at the Department of Justice, where three officials get \$8,000 or more - those figures apply to 1946 and there may be one now, but of those three none are French-speaking. At the National Film Board, none; Fisheries, nil; Reconstruction, not a single French-speaking official out of seven. At National Revenue, no French-speaking official. And so it runs in almost every department.

Mr. Chairman, how do you expect and how can members of this house expect that our French-speaking compatriots will feel perfectly at home in Ottawa when, for the discussion of their problems they cannot contact officials who understand their language and appreciate their outlook?

Mr. Chairman, to achieve fairness, the indispensable programme I now submit to the hon. members opposite is as follows: the appointment of six French-speaking deputy ministers; 18 officials paid \$8,000 a year or more; 88 officials getting \$6,000 or more; 352 officials with a salary of \$4,000 or more, and 1,185 other French-speaking civil servants paid at least \$3,000.





Those, Mr. Chairman, were the few comments I wished to make in this connection, and I hope they will be taken into consideration.

Mr. Hackett

I wish to add a few words to what has just been said by my learned colleague, the hon. member for St. Maurice-Laflèche (Mr. Hamel).

Some hon. members

Hear, hear!

Mr. Hackett

Unfortunately, I am the only member of my party in Quebec and since the majority of my electors are French Canadians, I believe it is my duty to support the remarks of my colleague the hon. member for St. Maurice-Laflèche.

Mr. Ferguson

Hear, hear!

Mr. Hackett

I have already stated in this house that it is unfortunate that a whole ethnical group should surrender to one party. That is unfortunate for the group, it is unfortunate for the party which takes in its fold; it is unfor-



tunate also for the opponent which is deprived of its support. I think it is unfortunate that my party should have no French-speaking representatives.

As a result, we do not know exactly what they think and we do not have the benefit of their philosophy of life and of their point of view.

I say it is unfortunate for the party in power because they take the liberty of doing injustices as were described by the hon. member who has just spoken. Injustice is prejudicial to everyone, especially to those who render themselves guilty of it. It is also unfortunate for the group which surrenders entirely to one political party because they will be treated inequitously and, like poor relatives, that is like penniless relatives, whom we accept somewhat scornfully and against our will.

I know that those problems are difficult to solve, but I hope that the situation will be remedied. I know the matter is being dealt with and I hope that the commission which is looking into the problem will shortly be in a position to report to the house that French-speaking Canadians are equitably represented in the public service and that there will be a sufficient number of French-Canadian senior officials suitably to represent that element of the population.





Mr. Michaud

Hear, hear!

Mr. Hackett

Let us put aside that question of ability. It is non-existent and none of those who are aware of the situation would even suggest that there is lack of talent, training or experience among French Canadians.

I therefore hope and wish that a fair solution will soon be found to that problem.

\* \* \* \* \*

July 8, 1947, p. 5124

Mr. J. I. Hamel (St. Maurice-Laflèche)

Mr. Speaker, before this bill is carried I want to put on record my strong opposition to it. To my mind, to raise the salaries of the members of the Civil Service Commission at this time is to give a premium for incompetence and systematic discrimination against almost one-third of Canada's citizens, those of French origin. I charge publicly and formally the Civil Service Commission with being responsible for the disunity existing so openly in this country at the present time. I charge formally the Civil Service Commission with having violated the fundamental principles of our democracy,



namely, representation by population. I charge the Civil Service Commission with being responsible for the loss of millions and millions of dollars of income yearly by my compatriots of French origin.

Before I resume my seat I want to express my deep regret at not having heard the leaders of the various political groups in this house take their stand on this all-important matter. That being so, those same leaders should stop wondering why they cannot obtain and secure substantial support in the province of Quebec.

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West)

Mr. Speaker, I want to express briefly my disappointment that this bill does not include merchant seamen in the veterans preference. I support the argument put forward by various members in that connection. I want to read a resolution which was passed at the provincial convention of the Canadian Legion held in Vernon, British Columbia, in May, and at which there were in attendance some three hundred members. I want to draw this resolution to the attention of the right hon. ministers. It reads:

Resolved that this convention request the dominion government to extend vocational training, university grants, and all other rehabilitation benefits to all veterans of Canada's wartime merchant navy who had service in any theatre which authorized the payment of the war risk bonus.



Veterans preference is a rehabilitation benefit. I hope that before another session rolls around the government will listen to the views of the troops, not only those in British Columbia but I am sure those throughout Canada, the men who served overseas and who recognize the great work these merchant seamen did.

Mr. Georges H. Heon (Argenteuil) (Translation)

Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted to say a few words on this matter before the motion for third reading of the bill is carried?

The debate on this measure has made clearer the deplorable treatment meted out to our French-speaking fellow-citizens in the dominion civil service.

Mr. Langlois

The Conservatives speak along the same lines.

Mr. Heon

So do intelligent liberals.

Some hon. members

Hear, hear.

Mr. Heon

Right-thinking people, who are free from narrow-mindedness or language or religious prejudice, recognize the merits of the representations submitted in that connection by the Chambre de Commerce Montreal, the Société Saint-Jean-Baptiste.





Some hon. members

Oh, oh.

Mr. Heon

It ill becomes you to laugh it off! The Quebec legislature and other representative bodies admit how urgent it is that according to principles of justice and equity and in the common interest something should be done to remedy such a situation which reflects no credit on those who created and encouraged it-

Mr. Rinfret

Who created it?

Mr. Heon

The hon. member had better ask who encouraged it. It is an insult to the racial group so victimized.

Mr. Speaker, need I repeat that it is dishonest to appeal for unity and point out that the two great races should cooperate in making this country greater, and more united, if in the dominion executive and administrative field, the representatives of the French-speaking group are excluded? It might also be worth while to emphasize that never, in the last twenty-five years, has French-Canadian public opinion within all provinces been much roused than on this matter. It is obvious that such concern will only abate when the wrongs are remedied and redressed.



I, for one, believe that the government should have the courage to deal at once with this problem; in so doing they will have the support of Canadians from all groups which are not blinded by fanaticism and hatred.

We are also informed that a committee of French-speaking members has been established for inquiring into the manner in which our fellow-citizens are treated, to the end that it make whatever recommendations are called for under the circumstances and that our people may obtain full justice.

I am second to none in wishing the greatest success to my hon. friends in the tremendous task which they have so resolutely tackled.

House of Commons Debates, March 1, 1948, p. 1759

Mr. Langlois

Needless to say I prefer the attitude taken by the religious leaders whom I have just quoted to that of our blatant patriot from Quebec.

Mr. Chaloult ended his long list of alleged injustices by the dominion government against French Canadians by stating that we had only one deputy minister in the whole federal administration. Mr. Chaloult is unaware or forgets that there are French Canadians with the title of deputy minister or the equivalent at the head of the following departments or departmental branches in Ottawa:





Transport, Mr. Brassard, Agriculture, Mr. Bouchard; Justice, Mr. Stein; National Defence, Mr. C. Mathieu; External Affairs, Mr. Beaudry; Labour, Mr. Ranger; Chief Electoral Officer, Mr. Castonguay; King's Printer, Mr. Cloutier; Clerk of the House, Dr. Beauchesne; Librarian, Mr. Desrochers; Archives, Mr. Lanctôt; Civil Service Commission, Mr. Thivierge. Others could be added.

Moreover, Mr. Chaloult is quite unaware that we also have in the diplomatic service the following French Canadians with the title of ambassadors or ministers:

The Honourable Victor Doré, Brussels; Chas. Hébert, Havana; Laureys, Denmark; Maurice Pope, Berlin; LaFlèche, Athens; Turgeon, Dublin; Desy, Rome; Dupuy, Holland, Vaillancourt, Yugoslavia, and finally, as consul general in Chicago, Mr. Turcotte.

Mr. Chaloult forgets also that we have in the government of our country three parliamentary assistants out of a total of nine, that is in the departments of Labour, National Defence and Finance.

Finally, he forgets that out of eighteen members of the cabinet, six are French Canadians, namely the minister of External Affairs and Public Works, the Postmaster General, the Minister of Transport, the Solicitor General and the minister of National Health and Welfare.



Mr. Chaloult therefore does not tell the truth and I see no reason to bring evidence in order to prove that the rest of his statement is not according to facts.

As to his insults against Sir Wilfrid Laurier, I shall not dwell upon them. Suffice it to say that they come from a man who, a certain day, has tried to blacken his own constituents. I have nothing to add to the judgment passed by history on Sir Wilfrid Laurier but I may say to the man who has tried to tarnish his memory that he has nothing to fear from history. His name will not be mentioned.

Mr. Chaloult concluded his remarks by an appeal to members of the Union Nationale, of the Bloc Populaire and Social Crediters to join their forces against the Liberals in the province of Quebec. The same appeal had come a few days before from a too well known Ontario pastor, in the Gospel Witness of February 19.

House of Commons Debates, March 18, 1948, p. 2335.

French Canadians in the Civil Service

Mr. Gagnon

1. Since 1945, has the government entrusted some members of this house with an inquiry into the position of French Canadians in the civil service, both as to their number and their rank?



2. If so, what are the names of the said members?
3. Has a report of their activities been submitted to the government?
4. If not, for what reason?
5. If so, when will such report be published?

Mr. Mackenzie King

1. Yes
2. Honourable Joseph Jean.
3. Oral reports to cabinet from time to time.
4. See No. 3.
5. No decision taken by the cabinet yet.

February 24, 1949, p. 884-5

M. Langlois.

"Allow me now to congratulate and thank on behalf of my compatriots of Quebec the right honourable Prime Minister in the deserving effort he has made and the practical results he has achieved, since his rise to his present position, in order to give a fairer representation to my French-Canadian compatriots in the Civil Service,





Last year I had the opportunity to discuss this question of the federal civil service, and more particularly, of our French-Canadian representation in that service. In the speech I made at that time, I answered a so-called Nationalist who took a gloomy view (this was Wilfred Lacroix) of the situation in so far as our representation in the civil service was concerned. In order not to paint so gloomy a picture for those of my province who might like to enter the civil service in Ottawa, I thought it advisable to point out to this house that we had had some success in that field in the past.

Besides, my views at the time were justified, for, later on the Jean report acknowledged that one of the reasons why there were not enough French Canadians in the civil service in Ottawa, was that our prospective applicants had been made timorous and that out citizens from the province of Quebec were afraid to apply for a position in the federal civil service..."



## PRESS ACCOUNTS OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE

The Ottawa Journal, Friday, June 27, 1947.

Mr. King Appoints Joseph Jean to Boost French in CS Jobs.

Solicitor General Joseph Jean was named by Prime Minister King Thursday as Cabinet representative to carry out recommendations of a five-man committee of Liberal members of the Commons for increasing the number of French-speaking Canadians in the Civil Service.

The appointment was made at a special meeting of the Cabinet, called by the Prime Minister as the climax to closed sittings of the committee since it was given its task by the Quebec Liberal caucus two months ago.

No specific recommendations from among the six memoranda its members have submitted to Mr. King have been made public, but it is understood they are designed to implement a long-range program which will go into operation soon and which will not aim at discrimination against English Canadians or at disrupting the theory that the man with the best qualifications should get the job, regardless of race.

The committee's appointment came as the result of considerable agitation in Quebec over the fact that there has been a steady drop in French-speaking representation in the Civil Service, and that not one of the Deputy Ministers in charge of a department is French.





The members are Roch Pinard (L-Chambly-Rouville), René Beaudoin (L-Vaudreuil-Soulanges), Gleason Belzile (L-Rimouski), Bona Arsenault, (L-Bonaventure), and Wilfrid Lacroix (L-Québec-Montmorency). They have sat often and for long hours, have interviewed both Government and outside representatives and will continue to carry on.

One of their primary tasks will be to seek out, if necessary, highly-qualified French-Canadians when a vacancy occurs for a deputy minister or other high posts. It is understood that they have already made a recommendation to the Prime Minister for one big job.

One suggestion which it is reported they might urge is that there be more appointments of dual deputies such as there now are in the Revenue Department where there are men in charge of both taxation and customs. In the Mines Department, for instance, there might be one deputy in charge of mining, another in charge of immigration.

The "Committee of Five", a group of French-speaking members of Parliament from Quebec appointed by a caucus of Quebec Liberal members, has already made preliminary reports of its findings to the Cabinet, a spokesman of the committee told The Journal last night.



Not on Nationalist Basis

"What we distinctly wish understood", he said, "is that our committee was not formed on a nationalist basis to demand what some term 'our share' or important Government positions or of all Government positions.

"We feel the Civil Service would be strengthened by having a larger proportion of bilingual senior officials. If a man best qualified for, say a deputy ministership, does not speak French, it is no part of our policy to suggest he be not given the position. We want the best man for the post. But we feel strongly that in past years qualifications of French-speaking Canadians have not been appreciated at their full value."

Members of the "Committee of Five", he emphasized, find it difficult to believe that not a single French-speaking Canadian is qualified to be Deputy Minister of a Department. Yet there are 20 deputy ministers and none of them bilingual.

Solicitor-General Joseph Jean may or may not sit with the committee, its spokesman explained, but was chosen by the Prime Minister to be the permanent liaison between the committee and the Cabinet.

"We are not asking for the appointment of any man to any Government position" the Committee spokesman explained, "simply on account of religion, language or race. We do





feel that more highly trained bilingual officials are needed in order that the best possible service be given to the people of Canada as a whole."

Committee members have already communicated through Mr. Jean with certain members of the Cabinet as to the form of requisition filled out by departments and sent to the Civil Service Commission when new appointments to the Civil Service are being made.

#### Hidden Discrimination

"Even with the best will in the world on the part of Minister and Deputy, we have found hidden discrimination against French-speaking Canadians. For instance, many requisitions are marked "English Only Required", when the person chosen for the post might be called on to deal with French-speaking people.

"Our committee has and will make not only general representations on this subject but will discuss individual cases when they are brought to our attention. If requisitions are made out by a branch head in a large department, it is quite possible that the deputy and the Minister will sign them almost automatically, trusting to the judgment of their officials. Should we come across what we feel to be discrimination in matters of this kind, we will ask Mr. Jean to discuss it either with the Minister directly concerned or with the Cabinet as a whole", he explained.





The "Committee of Five" has been given an official character by its members receiving a formal letter of appointment from the Cabinet, in which it is stated that it will have a "degree of permanency" and will function between as well as during sessions of Parliament.

Asked directly if the committee was desirous of having a French-speaking Canadian appointed as the new Director-General of the Civil Service, the committee spokesman said no such intention had been voiced.

#### Favor Bi-lingual Apointee

"If a bi-lingual man can qualify for this important post", he said, "we would welcome his appointment. After all, a Director-General of the Public Service would deal with people speaking both languages. It is not unnatural to believe that in this case bi-lingualism would be an asset.

"There is no intent on the part of any of our members to overthrow existing conditions in the Service or recommend any revolutionary moves. We do hope, however, to make the Service more conscious than it has been in past years of the value of bi-lingual officials in a very large number of positions.



"We are not asking for any special privilege or for favors. We are asking for more equitable treatment of French-speaking officials in the service with a view to having a better, more efficient and stronger public service."

The committee, he added, proposed to make known to graduates of French-language universities in the Province of Quebec, the fact that Civil Service positions were open to them and that they will be welcomed into the service. He conceded that appointment of French-speaking Canadians to Civil Service posts was "not a matter which could be dealt with in a few months or a year", but would spread over a number of years.

"According to figures before us, only 10 percent of the civil servants in Canada are French-speaking and of 20 deputy ministers none are fluent speakers of French. We scarcely feel that justice is being done."

The Ottawa Journal, Saturday, June 28, 1947.

#### French Canadians in the Civil Service

There should be no objection to Mr. King's naming Solicitor General Joseph Jean as Cabinet representative to work with the five-man committee of Liberal members of the Commons which seeks to have adequate representation in the Civil Service of the French-Canadian population.





Nor should there be any argument with the committee's stated objective: that all jobs be filled by the best men available regardless of race but that the French-Canadian race be not overlooked in the search for qualified men.

There may be some question, however, of why such a committee should be composed only of Liberals. And there will be strong objection if the committee oversteps its stated policy and seeks to man the Civil Service strictly on a per-capita basis of French and English Canadians. There is simply no room for such tampering with the usual practices of administration. The best men should be sought for all jobs, and if for reasons of education or tradition or location there seem to be fewer French-Canadians in the ranks of the best men this is something that the French Canadians must remedy at the source and not at the Civil Service's employment office.

In particular there will be broad disagreement with one of the committee's stated policies: that there be more appointments of dual deputies. The instance is given that in the Department of Mines there might be a deputy in charge of mines and another in charge of immigration. This to provide more deputy-posts and presumably to enable French Canadians to fill them.



It may be that in the Mines Department or in other departments the work has increased in volume and variety so that two deputies may be needed instead of one. Where that is so there will not likely be much public objection to amending the establishment. But to create a second deputy and its consequent parallel establishment from top to bottom simply to find a French Canadian a deputy's chair would be fantastic and extravagant humbug. That a spokesman of the "committee of five" should put forth such a thought will not win for his group the confidence it should have. We imagine there are some grounds for French-Canadian complaint and disappointment in this whole matter - but the Quebec members and Mr. Jean will accomplish nothing if they seek to adjust their grievances in anything but the most businesslike way.

#### REACTION TO THE JEAN INVESTIGATION

The Ottawa Journal, June 30, 1947.

#### Members Resent Interference in C. S. Affairs

Appointment of five Quebec members of Parliament to a committee seeking a "new deal" for French-speaking Canadians in the Civil Service of Canada opens possibilities "endless in their implications", Social Credit Leader Solon Low told The Journal.



"Let me say first", Mr. Low said, "that I feel French-speaking Canadians should have their fair share of Dominion Government position for which they are qualified."

#### Doubts Merits of Plan

"I doubt very much the merit of appointment of such a committee. We have what we all believe to be a fair and impartial Civil Service Commission whose duty it is to supervise such matters as promotions and appointments to the Government service. For my part, I am quite prepared to leave such matters to their good judgment.

"It is important that this country have the very best material for the Civil Service. I feel that the man who ranks highest in a competitive examination is the man who should get the job, regardless of creed, race or language.

"Here we have a committee of members from the Province Quebec named to see that their constituents and people from Quebec generally get a fair deal in the Civil Service. Well, why not have a similar committee from Alberta or Prince Edward for that matter?

"If it is a question of race, we have two Ukrainian members of Parliament. They could demand formation of a committee to see justice is done to Ukrainians in the matter of government jobs. We have two Jewish members. They might





properly seek formation of a committee to see that Jewish applicants for Civil Service jobs get fair play. Oh, the possibilities of the thing are endless."

### Jaenicke Is Opposed

Frank E. Jaenicke, CCF member for Kindersley, Sas., told the Journal:

"I feel it is most improper to leave selection of men for important Civil Service posts to a committee of five politicians.

"While I am not aware of the proportion of French-speaking personnel in the Service at large, I know that this element is very well represented from highest positions to the lowest right here in the House of Commons.

"From what I have read and what I have been told, I gather that one reason there is not a larger proportion of French-speaking Canadians in higher posts of the Civil Service is that in the past their educational system has centred more on the classical than the scientific side.

"I feel very strongly that race should have no weight in determining the nomination of a deputy minister. What we want is that our deputy ministers should be Canadians with the highest qualifications. Whether their antecedents are French, Scotch, Irish, German or Russian is immaterial as long as they are Canadians.



### Return to Patronage

"It is quite wrong that a committee of the House of Commons should be given the right even to recommend appointees for higher Civil Service positions. It is a return to the old patronage system and a bypassing of the Civil Service Commission.

"I regret that this committee was appointed. I would equally regret the appointment of a similar committee seeking a 'new deal' or a 'fair deal' for English-speaking applicants for Government posts.

"Appointment of this committee, I would say, is certainly not conducive to the national unity for which we all are striving or for which we all should strive."

No comment on the appointment of the committee was available today from Progressive Conservative sources.

The Ottawa Journal, July 3, 1947.

Working at top speed, the Committee of Five French-Canadian MP's surveying the Civil Service with the objective of increasing its bilingual representation, already has formally recommended the appointment of three new deputy ministers.

In its sixth report being tabled this afternoon or in additional reports to be made very shortly, the Committee will request the appointment of an additional four French-Canadian deputies.





### Favoured Candidates

The Committee, in its first five reports coming out of 23 meetings since it was set up on June 27, has recommended the naming of French Canadians, and has even selected its favoured candidates to succeed, on their retirement.

1. Frank Brown as Income Tax Commissioner and joint Deputy Revenue Minister;
2. Dr. Arthur Beauchesne as Clerk of the Commons;
3. Commander C. F. Edwards as Transport Deputy.

In subsequent reports to be tabled shortly, the Committee will advise dual deputies in at least four departments on the same basis as Health and Revenue, each having two deputy ministers.

### Joint Deputies

The appointment of joint deputies was being recommended for:

1. Agriculture, one deputy to administer Eastern Canada, and the second the west;
2. Justice, one to administer the English Common Law, and the second the French Civil Code;
3. Mines and Resources, one to run Immigration, and the second the remaining branches of the department;
4. Trade and Commerce, one to supervise internal business, and the second to administer imports and exports.



Committee members were contending the identity of their candidates for the position of Commons Clerk, and Transport Deputy remained "confidential".

But there was nothing "confidential" in their recommendation of a candidate to succeed deputy Revenue Minister Brown.

They have asked for the appointment of 52 year old Louis Hudon, general manager of Sorel Industries, and former dollar a year man on the wartime staffs of the Munitions and the Reconstructions Departments.

Mr. Hudon has been approached, and is inclined to make the sacrifice of accepting the \$16,000 a year appointment, as an "example" to other French Canadian or bilingual business executives to enter public service.

#### Claim Credit for These

The Committee of Five was instrumental in the making of several recent senior Civil Service appointments, including:

1. Laurent Beaudry as Joint Under-Secretary of State;
2. Gustave Brault as Chief Engineer of Public Works;
3. Robert Blais as Chief Architect of Public Works;
4. A. Papineau-Couture as Joint Director of the National Health Laboratories.



The Committee further intends insisting on the appointment of French Canadians where vacancies through retirements occur to the posts of:

1. Parliamentary Librarian;
2. Director of the Archives;
3. Chief Electoral Officer.

Comprising five MP's, headed by Roch Pinard, Liberal member for Chambly-Rouville, the Committee has held frequent meetings with Hon. Joseph Jean, liaison officer for the Cabinet.

Why so Few French Canadians in Civil Service? Committee Asks  
By Frank Flaherty. (Saturday Night, July 19, 1947)

A lot of people were busy trying to find someone to blame for the fact that apparently there are too few French-speaking Canadians employed in the public service, especially in the more responsible and higher-paid posts. Some members of Parliament blame the Civil Service Commission. Others blame the ministers and the Prime Minister. Others blame the Quebec members of Parliament. Others the deputy ministers and senior officers of the departments.

Assurance of action can be found in the admission of Hon. Colin Gibson, Secretary of State, in the House of Commons that "There are fewer French-speaking civil servants than representation by population would entitle them to," and the





statement of Rt. Hon. Ian Mackenzie, Minister of Veterans' Affairs, that in filling positions "There are two principles to be observed, the efficiency of the service and the promotion of national unity."

The consideration of national unity has arisen sharply within the last few months. It involves not only the lofty concept of harmony in the state but also the chances of the Liberal party keeping its Quebec following and the chances of the Progressive-Conservative party securing a Quebec following.

Some months ago the Quebec legislature passed a resolution deploring the inadequate representation of French-speaking Canadians in the federal service. A few weeks ago a delegation from the Chambre de Commerce de Montréal came to Ottawa with a similar protest. It was apparent that a situation existed which was about to be exploited politically in the province of Quebec, and Liberal members of parliament from Quebec decided they had to do something about it.

A committee of five was chosen with a similar protest. It was apparent that a situation existed which was about to be exploited politically in the province of Quebec, and Liberal members of parliament from Quebec decided they had to do something about it.



A committee of five was chosen from the Liberal caucus to look into the matter. The committee, although entirely unofficial was given a sort of semi-official status by having attached to it a cabinet minister, Hon. Joseph Jean, Solicitor General. He will be its liaison with the cabinet. The fact that the opposition is alive to the explosive nature of the issue was indicated by the absence of any criticism of the creation of a committee to deal with a public matter from a caucus and without any authority from the house.

The matter came to a head because of two things which stick out into the public view... recent appointments of deputy ministers have places formerly held by French-speaking, and a situation in the income tax office at Montreal where most of the senior officials for a time had non-French names. The taxpayers of Montreal, it was alleged, had to speak English if they wanted to discuss tax problems with a senior official. The Montreal situation was never that bad and has since been changed.

The deputy minister situation is not quite as bad as some Quebec critics would make it appear by a surface view of it. There are now no French-speaking officials actually holding the title of deputy minister, but out of about 31 officials listed who described as having the rank of deputy by statute





there are eight French-speaking persons, including such men as Jules Castonguay, the Chief Electoral Officer and Edmond Cloutier, the King's Printer. It is still a bald fact, however, that no Minister of the Crown has as his chief and immediate assistant a French-speaking official.

### Cover-All Decline

Apart from this situation regarding the higher officers there has over a period of years been a decline in the over-all percentage of French-speaking employees to the total number of civil servants. There are actually no solid official figures, but the decline is admitted, Mr. Joseph Hamel, Bloc Populaire member for St. Maurice-Laflèche, who aired the matter on the floor of the house, said the over-all percentage of French-speaking employees to the total number of civil servants had dropped from 21.58% before 1918 to 12.25% now. And, he pointed out, 30 per cent of the population is French-speaking.

Privately at least not many Quebec members would go along with Mr. Hamel in his implied suggestion that the principle of representation by population or a racial basis should apply to the civil service as it does to parliament on a



provincial basis. That would probably give rise to claims from other racial groups and certainly detract from the efficiency and flexibility of the service.

They do, however, insist that the French-speaking element should not be conspicuous by its absence from the higher ranks and that there be sufficient competent French-speaking employees all through the service to ensure that any citizen who wishes to transact his business with the Government in French can do so.

So far as the service generally is concerned the present low percentage of French-speaking can be attributed in part to the special recruiting drives put on by some departments during the war. They got their staffs where they could. The top officials were English-speaking. These officials looked to the men they knew and so the great structure of the department of Munitions and Supply was thrown together. After the end of hostilities a good number of these people looked for and found places in other departments. They had the experience and the departments wanted them.

### Language Factor

There are other factors both of a temporary and long-term character which affect the make-up of the service. As to initial appointments there are few posts which can be filled by a person who speaks only French. There are many which can





be filled by a person who speaks only English. There are a substantial number which require bilingual ability and a larger number in which bilingual ability is desirable. As a rule, however, English is necessary and French-speaking Canadians who do not know English have no chance. That excludes a good chunk of the French-speaking population.

When you narrow down the recruiting area of the service in French-speaking Canada thus another factor enters, competition. There are lots of employment opportunities, especially now, for competent bilingual people, whether they be stenographers, accountants, scientists or executives. Private firms are looking for them, ready to pay higher salaries than the government offers. The public service runs up against stiffer competition in its search for competent French-speaking employees than it does in its search for English-speaking ones. That applies all down the line but it applies especially to top-flight technical and administrative posts.

Another factor is personal convenience, family and social relationships. The civil service is in Ottawa, largely an English-speaking community. It means more to a man from a





city or town in Quebec to pull up stakes and move to Ottawa than it does to a man from from Ontario, Manitoba or Nova Scotia. He may speak English perfectly and be at home with English-speaking people but his wife may not. His living costs may be considerably higher.

Just recently a government department sought the service of a man in Quebec. He was interested in coming and was earning \$5,500 a year. After looking the Ottawa situation over he decided he would need \$8,500 in Ottawa to be as well off as where he was. That was more than the department could pay.

#### Should Be Bilingual

The answer given by departmental officials to charges of discrimination is that they are looking for competent bilingual help, take all they can get. The answer from the Civil Service Commission, is that they provide bilingual help whenever departments ask for it and that they lean over backwards to qualify a bilingual applicant for any position, whether or not it calls for two languages. There are, however, two points at which discrimination can operate, at the initial appointment and at the time for advancement. Some French-speaking members of Parliament, who have looked into the thing and are prepared to attribute a lower number of appointments to lack of applicants rather than to discrimination, are not sure that there is no discrimination in promotions. There will be more probing of that angle before the matter is dropped.



Leaving out any suggestion of deliberate discrimination, it is a fact that French-speaking employees suffer certain disadvantages and enjoy certain advantages. If they can overcome the disadvantages, the advantages begin to operate.

If a civil servant is working at a job where his French is important he may be passed over when a better job opens up because he cannot easily be replaced in his old job and the new job can be filled equally well by another who knows no French. If his mastery of English is imperfect, if he associates only with French-speaking people, does not mix with the others his ability may attract less notice than that of other candidates for promotion. If he does demonstrate his ability and does mix, his chances of promotion are probably better than if he had English only. He has the advantage of two languages and his advancement gives his superiors a chance to show that they are doing their bit to maintain the principle of representation.

The five-man committee will probably work quietly from now on. It will concern itself with finding out when vacancies occur and then getting after people to fill them. It will function partly as a recruiting agency for some of the higher posts which are in the gift of the cabinet. It may well be found trying to persuade some people who are earning larger incomes to accept government appointments at a sacrifice, in order to get higher posts filled with French-speaking people who will be a credit to their racial group.





Minutes of the First Meeting of the Jean Committee, July 2, 1947.

"Messrs. Benoit Godbout, D. H. W. Henry and Paul Pelletier have been called by the Honourable Mr. Jean to form, under his chairmanship, a committee to assist him in the Civil Service Survey."

Mr. Jean explained that the Committee of Members of Parliament dealing with this question of representation of the French element in the Civil Service, studies more especially particular cases (this is, of course, a reference to the Committee of the Five) while the Minister intends to consider the problem as a whole, with a view to determining a general policy designed to remedy the situation. In a broadcast to be delivered in the near future, the Minister will develop two ideas:

1. The Civil Service must adapt itself to the needs of the population;
2. Qualified French Canadians should accept positions in the Civil Service even if their acceptance causes them some personal inconvenience.

(This was not, according to a member of the committee, Mr. Jean's first thought. He had first suggested that the Civil Service lower its standards to permit the entry of French



Canadians of an educational background differing from that of English Canadians, into the Public Service. This was not acceptable, and he then saw the problem in terms of a reorientation of the Province of Quebec educational system, to provide people qualified in economics, political science, and public administration.)

"It is agreed that, as a first step, a census of the positions held in the various departments and agencies of the Government paid over \$2500 has to be made. It is also found advisable to secure at the same time, a list of all vacancies in the Civil Service, and of the Vacancies which are seemed to take place in the near future.

Then the Minister entrusted Mr. Pelletier with the drafting of a letter to all Cabinet Ministers to ask their co-operation, a copy of which is to be addressed to all Deputy Ministers. To that, a circular letter is to be attached, copy of the Privy Council's letter instructing the Honourable Mr. Jean to undertake this task. Mr. Henry suggested that a representative of the Civil Service Commission be asked to attend the meeting which will take place with Heads of the various departments. This suggestion meeting with the Minister's approval, Mr. Pelletier will prepare a letter to Mr. Bland. (Chairman of the Civil Service Commission)



Mr. Pelletier will furnish the Minister with a list of all Departments and Agencies of the Government.

In a first report to the Cabinet, to be drafted by Mr. Pelletier, the Minister will ask to be given the authority to have referred to him recommendations for appointments or promotions to positions of \$2500 or over.

Arrangements will be made by Mr. Pelletier with Mr. Brown of the National Revenue Department, for a preliminary meeting on Friday the sixth."

Interesting to note that the meetings were conducted in English, and that the minutes were also written in that language. As there was a proportion of three French-speaking Canadians to one English-speaking Canadian, this is perhaps significant.)

Another record of the meeting was kept by Mr. Pelletier:

"The Solicitor General stated that at a meeting of the Cabinet, held on June 26th, 1947, reference had been made to the importance in the national interest, of securing and maintaining in the Public Service of Canada a just proportion of Canadians of French origin. It had been pointed out that a serious attempt should be made to find means of adjusting the balance and of making available for appropriate positions qualified French Canadians.





To this end, the Cabinet had agreed that the Solicitor General should review with the Ministers responsible, with deputy heads, and with the Civil Service Commission, each of the Departments and Agencies of the government, with the object of reporting upon methods which might be adopted to improve the recent positions in this respect.

A letter from the Secretary of the Cabinet to the Solicitor General was read, of June 27th, 1947...;

Outlining the procedure he intended following in his review of French-Canadian representation in the Civil Service, the Solicitor General said he proposed as a first step:

a) that a thorough review of the situation as it existed presently be made in each department and agency individually through confidential interviews with Department Heads and the Civil Service Commission.

b) that a letter be prepared for circulation to all Ministers and their deputies, outlining the task he had been given and his intentions as regards the proposed confidential conversations with deputies;

c) that in view of the special circumstances surrounding the present establishment of the Montreal Income Tax Office, he propose to interview the Deputy Minister of National Revenue for Taxation at the earliest possible moment.



d) that a report be prepared for submission to the Cabinet at an early date, setting out the Minister's intentions with reference to the above and recommending that the Solicitor General be authorized to review all future appointments to positions of \$2500 or over, prior to their being given final approval (by Treasury Board)."

#### Further Meetings of The Jean Committee

On July 4, F. H. Brown met with the Committee, having first sent complete statistics on the Department of Labour. July 16 was the occasion of a meetings with Dr. H. L. Keenleyside Deputy Minister of Mines and Resources, and on August the 8th, C. H. Bland of the Civil Service Commission, and the French Secretary, Thivierge, met with Mr. Jean. Further meetings took place with Dr. Cameron of the Department of Health and Welfare, and with C.P. Edwards of Air Transport, and many more.

#### Mr. Jean's Account of His Investigation

The Hon. Mr. Jean himself gave an account of his work in an interview on February 4, 1966. He was under the impression that he had been appointed to the investigation by Order-in-Council in 1948, being in charge of investigating the bilingual question exhaustively, and empowered to make recommendations to the government on his findings. As he was appointed to the Bench in 1949, he was not able to complete the project. His reason for the formation of his committee was





his contention that the Committee of the Five had not the power to enable it to conduct an inquiry of this kind, or to make recommendations. In his own view the function of Little Chicago was to "faire admettre par le Cabinet qu'il y avait quelque chose à faire."

He recounted his asking the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission what the situation was. It appeared that the problem was to establish norms and qualifications for various posts, leading into the problem of establishing educational equivalents. According to Mr. Jean, candidates of French origin "ne croyaient pas à la fonction publique". They preferred to enter the service through their parliamentary representative if they could, rather than through ordinary recruiting channels. In his opinion, they tended to exaggerate the importance of influence in obtaining posts.

He immediately began to work with the Commissions Scolaires to establish equivalent standards, so that no French-speaking Canadian could be prevented from obtaining an appointment through lack of corresponding diplomas. Until he had worked out sensible evaluations to permit fair standards for positions advertised, French-speaking Canadians had been excluded from all but the most junior of posts.

He continued his investigation in the Government Departments, speaking to all heads, deputy heads etc, while constantly



receiving complaints from the province of Quebec that nothing was being done. He then tried, as each posts came vacant to find a French-speaking incumbent, usually from within the Service. Sometimes an associate deputy minister would ask him to locate as many as 20 French-speaking candidates, which he found impossible to locate. Often Mr. Jean discovered that few French Canadians would venture to Ottawa, even at a firm offer of a post, fearing the atmosphere in the city.

Since a post had come vacant in the Department of Finance, Mr. Jean recommended Georges Bouchard, then in the Public Service, and holder of a degree from the Ecole des Hautes Etudes Commerciales. A Harvard graduate was instead appointed, as Bouchard's degree was not recognized.

Mr. Jean referred to a practice common at the time: "Faire entrer un nom français pour être applaudi". Often too an English-speaking candidate would be given a bilingual post, even with rudimentary knowledge of the French language while the French-speaking candidate was required to be perfect in English.



Appendix CDocument

Topics studied by the Committee on Bilingualism  
(The Glassco Commission)

1. Manpower management in the government service: employees' recruitment and development, maintaining a proper ratio of French-speaking employees, and a proper balance of regional origin.
2. Paperwork and office systems. The cost of bilingualism. Internal Aspects: special problems; bilingualism: how needs are met, the effect on paperwork, the translation service.
3. Public Information Service; Administrative aspects, French language aspects.
4. Medical and Hospital services: extent of French language service available at Queen Mary, and Ste Anne Veterans' hospitals and at Fort Chimo.
5. French language ability in the departments and agencies of the government, with a separate study on the Department of External Affairs.
6. French language ability of higher public servants.
7. Bilingualism in the services and in the Department of National Defence.





8. Bilingualism in Switzerland, South Africa and Belgium, with possible applications for the Canadian situation.
9. A questionnaire on personnel, suppressed at the moment it was to be sent out.
10. Recruitment of French-speaking university students for the public service.
11. French language instruction in Federal Government schools.
12. French language instruction to Indians in the province of Quebec.
13. Bilingualism in courses given to Veterans.
14. The importance of French in educational programs in radio and television.
15. The teaching of French at the RCAF base at Trenton.



AppendixSuggested Recommendations of the Committee

Out of the investigation of the Bilingual Committee arose many recommendations and suggestions.

The report on bilingual paperwork listed these recommendations:

1. That a uniform written policy on bilingualism to be applied throughout all departments and agencies, be defined by the Government.
2. That the essential of this policy should be:
  - In matters relating to correspondence, internal paperwork forms, reports, directives and circulars:
    - (a) correspondence.

In order to reduce costs and to avoid delays, that translation of correspondence be gradually eliminated as bilingualism develops throughout the Service.

That correspondence with individual employees in connection with personnel administration be carried out in their mother tongue. To these was added:

1. Correspondence translation should be withdrawn from the Translation Bureau, but the responsibility for translation of correspondence should not become the all-encompassing chore of the senior French-speaking officer.





2. An end should be made to the practice existing in some departments requiring French-speaking officers to dictate all letters in English.
3. Consideration should be given to the proposal that a Faculty of Translation be established at the University of Ottawa.
4. There should be special allowances for bilingual stenographers.

The study of external forms which might be made bilingual produced further suggestions. A bilingual form was considered to be one not more than four pages in total. Forms used only for an isolated specific use and for an isolated English-speaking area were not considered in the possible bilingual group.

In a study of 3,974 forms it was found that 72% of the total could be made completely bilingual. The complete bilingual forms, as defined for the study, represented 49% of all the forms in use at the present time.

### Costs

A bilingual one-side form in quantities of 10,000 appears to cost about 15% more than an English one-side form. In quantities of 50,000 or 100,000, the extra cost is only about 5%. The resulting picture: present printing costs would increase by about \$80,000 of which external forms would account for about 40%.



## Conclusion

Complete bilingualism in forms can be achieved with small additional cost to the government. It is possible for 84% of the present forms (i.e. 93% of all forms) to be made bilingual immediately.

## Recommendations

1. That all forms be made bilingual.
2. That a French text form be made available immediately for all present English forms until bilingual forms are available.
3. That quantities and frequency of use be ignored in considering conversion to bilingualism.
4. That all internal forms be bilingual or English on one side and French on the other. If the administration is to reflect the bilingual character of the country the use of bilingual forms is necessary.

## Directives, manuals, circulars:

That instructions, in the forms of directives etc. be given in both languages to all employees, at least in Ottawa and in all regional offices located in the Province of Quebec, and also in any other office where the number of French-speaking employees is of 10% or more.



In the Province of Quebec where only 17% of the population is English-speaking, only three cities are not obliged to bilingual documents and the situation is the same in the large majority of towns. We think that the percentage of 10% is reasonable to ensure adequate service to the employees and the population.

That the French language be gradually allowed use at any level of Government activity in Ottawa as bilingualism develops throughout the Service. That the use of the French language be immediately allowed to all regional offices located in the Province of Quebec in their local dealings and in their dealings with their headquarters.

That where possible, more reference material be provided in French.

In matters relating to external forms:

That all circulating forms be made bilingual without regard to cost. By circulating form, we mean any form which may change hands before returning to the Government (examples are cheques, T4, etc.)

That any form be made bilingual where physical combination is possible and where the cost of producing a bilingual form (taking into account savings in storage space, manipulation, etc.) would be less than or equal to the cost of providing separate English and French forms English on one side and French on reverse.





In other cases forms, English on one side and French on reverse side, should be preferred to separate English and French forms; this should particularly be the case when the increased cost would be compensated by savings in storage space, manipulation, etc. In any manner, however:

- a) French forms should be made available even if the requirement is only for one form. In the case where the number of French forms required would not justify printing, typed or mimeographed forms should be provided.
- b) Every form printed in one language should be the indication that it is also available in the other language. When such forms are mailed from mailing lists, they should also ask a question as to the language preference of the user, in order to make corrections to mailing lists if necessary.

That uniform application of the policy throughout the service be assured by the Central Forms Control Committee, and that the application of the policy, within individual departments or agencies, be the responsibility of a high ranking French-speaking officer of the department.



Other recommendations:

1. That means be taken to make Ottawa services better known to French-speaking Canadians.
2. That, until a better bilingual service is developed, and if found practical, translation of documents be limited to cases where the document is to be dealt with by a person not having a sufficient knowledge of French.

Alternatives rejected:

1. Use of bilingual stenographers for answering correspondence.
2. Application of the same rule for internal forms as for external forms.
3. External bilingual forms for Province of Quebec only.
4. External forms all bilingual.

Recruitment for the Public Service: Suggested Solutions

The question of recruiting for the public service from the French-speaking universities was also investigated. Mr. J. LaRivière gave an account of an interview on this subject with Mr. Marcel Cloutier, Director of the Placement service of the University of Montreal. The purpose of the interview was to discover why the Civil Service Commission





found such great difficulty in recruiting university graduates. In 1960, 41 candidates took the examination, 15 passed, but only 6 were placed on the list for acceptance and offered employment. None of these 6 accepted employment, so, in that year, no graduate of the largest French-speaking university entered the public service.

The main factors contributing to such a situation were found to be the following:

The examination period came too early in the year for candidates to have made definite plans. This was in the opinion of the reporter, due to poor coordination between the departments and the Civil Service Commission. There was a delay between the examinations and the oral examination, and a further delay until employment was actually offered. A candidate had to wait six months before knowing whether or not he was accepted. In Montreal, there was strong competition from the big private companies which have a more efficient system of recruiting, with little delay. Further, the so-called objective examination which formed part of the testing was badly suited to the French language candidates.

On the part of the French-speaking candidates themselves, there existed a great fear of assimilation into the English-speaking community, with concomitant anxiety about the



possibilities of a French education for children. Another factor contributing to the unwillingness to consider the public service as a career was a traditional hostility to the federal public service itself.

The suggestions arising from this analysis of the situation were:

- a) the establishment of a commission made up of French university professors to obtain a federal administration representative of the two ethnic groups.
- b) the implementation of any recommendation aiming to stimulate the use of the French language within the Public Service.

#### Information Services: Solutions

1. Unnecessary delays in the appearance of the French version of publications could be avoided by not publishing unnecessary material.
2. A consultative tripartite board or committee should be formed to help establish an intelligent programme of French publication.
3. Press releases should be given in both languages simultaneously.



4. Higher salaries and reclassification is needed for translating positions.
5. A branch of the Translation Bureau should be established in Quebec City.
6. Bilingual information officers should be autonomous, organizing their own section and reporting directly to the Deputy Minister.

#### Educational goals

1. Bilingualism should be an educational goal of all Service Colleges and as far as possible, in all other federal schools (i.e. for dependents of public servants abroad, Indians, Eskimos etc.).
2. To make civil servants bilingual after entry should be the educational aim of the Government, with French language courses available to all.
3. Some measure of bilingual instruction should be introduced into Ottawa schools.

#### Department of External Affairs

1. All Foreign Service officers should be required to have a working knowledge of French after one year in the service, and a good knowledge after two years' service, given language courses available to them during working hours.





2. It should be the constant policy of the Department to have a French-speaking person occupy either the under-secretary post, or the deputy under-secretary position. There should be a French-speaking person among the assistant under-secretaries.
3. Monthly meetings between French Canadians of the Department, and leaders of the French-speaking community of Quebec should be held.
4. Key diplomatic posts must be given to French-speaking persons on a regular and constant basis.

#### General Bilingualism within the Public Service

1. There should be a series of recommendations for making the civil service at Ottawa bilingual to a sufficient degree so that French-speaking members of the country will participate in it.
2. Premiums should be given for bilingualism, considered to be a higher skill.
3. Une politique uniforme de l'administration, basée sur le pourcentage des populations de langue française ou anglaise des villes ou régions desservies par les bureaux régionaux des ministères s'avère donc indispensable, si l'on entend donner aux Canadiens de langue française un service équivalent à ceux de langue anglaise.



### Hospital Services

A limited study of the bilingual service to patients of the Queen Mary and Ste-Anne Hospitals concluded the studies done by the Committee. It was generally found that this service was inadequate. Of 96 nurses on the Queen Mary Veterans' Hospital, 49 were unilingual and English speaking. It was recommended that bilingual service be extended especially in the case of psychiatrists, who, if unilingual English-speaking, cannot adequately interpret the problems of a French-speaking patient.

It was further recommended that part of the Ste-Anne de Bellevue hospital be abolished, and that veterans suffering from recurring diseases be treated at local hospitals.

Dr. Gilbert, Director General of the Quebec Province suggested these recommendations.

### Suggested Solutions to the Problem of Bilingualism

Another memorandum on the same subject suggested the following solutions. In the final report of the Commission, a brief summary of the actual existing situation gave a picture from the results of the findings of the Committee, but nothing was directly presented as a solution or recommendation.





The solutions in one of the internal memoranda were as follows:

1. "Rendre intelligible et sympathique l'administration fédérale aux Canadiens d'expression française, par une publicité soignée et des relations humaines méthodiques.
2. Que l'administration fédérale de concert avec l'administration provinciale de Québec favorise la création d'une école de fonctionnarisme de langue française, soit à l'université Laval, auprès du gouvernement provincial; soit à l'université de Montréal, auprès d'importants services du triple gouvernement fédéral, provincial et municipal.
3. Favoriser l'emploi de personnes bilingues à tous les postes de direction et l'exiger dans tous les milieux où l'usage de la langue française est courant.
4. Assurer dans tous les services des ministères la présence d'officiers de langue française, suffisante pour que la correspondance, l'interview et les relations avec le personnel et le public puissent être conduits en langue française.
5. Instituer un comité permanent sur le bilinguisme dans chacun des ministères et de l'étude des doléances et revendications du public concernant le bilinguisme."



### Bilinguisme dans les forces armées

"Il n'y a pas d'armée canadienne au sens plein du mot, c'est-à-dire qui soit le reflet des deux nations qui composent le Canada, comme c'est le cas en Belgique et en Suisse. Ici l'armée est anglaise. Elle l'est non seulement par la langue mais encore par l'esprit qui l'anime et les méthodes qu'elle utilise.

Au départ la recrue de langue française est victime de discrimination. Tandis que le Canadien de langue anglaise est admis tout de suite à l'entraînement dans l'unité de son choix, le Canadien de langue française doit passer par un camp spécial où, pendant plusieurs mois il sera astreint à une étude intensive de l'anglais (à moins d'être déjà parfaitement bilingue? ce qui est l'exception). Celui-ci sera ensuite placé dans une unité de langue anglaise et devra s'il veut obtenir des promotions aussi rapidement que son collègue anglais s'assimiler le plus vite possible au "milieu".

En cas de mariage, des problèmes familiaux surgiront s'il se trouve posté en dehors du Québec: ses enfants devront fréquenter une école où l'enseignement se donne uniquement en anglais. Il n'est donc pas étonnant que la proportion des Canadiens de langue française dans l'armée soit si faible.



## Recommendations

This Royal Commission cannot afford to ignore the present outburst of separatist talk and its significance as an index to unsolved problems of Canadian federalism. And while the Department of External Affairs represents the most successful image of the two great language groups working together in the public service - in numbers, quality and career - nevertheless a foreign office above all should give effective meaning to biculturalism. As stated before, every officer in the Department of External Affairs whose mother tongue is English should have a working knowledge of French without expecting its mastery; while a fresh look should be taken at the whole problem of departmental documentation in order to see how far the use of the French language can be made a regular part of the Department's functions.

## Representation

### 1. Difficulty of recruiting young French Canadians.

Less attracted now than ten years ago "because they have been led to believe that they do not necessarily have access, on the same basis as the others, to certain key-posts, and second that a career in the Department of External Affairs means permanent uprooting from their original environment." (An amelioration) ...





Special Report on External Affairs  
Investigation

Study Preliminary Report

1. A special approach to the French Canadian officers' or sub-staff's desire to keep fresh their links with French Canada may require a possible program of sabbaticals to return to Quebec...
2. Summary of affairs: the conduct of foreign policy is done almost exclusively in the English language. 25% of officers have a reasonable, good or better than good command of French, including the FC.127 do not claim to have competence: proportion of non competents too high.  
"requires a French-speaking representation at the senior level, which will ensure at all times a fair understanding of the processes of adaptation which the French-Canadian officers and sub-staff experience when joining External Affairs.

Recommendations

"While the appointment to any post must be decided on merits and competency, it must be borne in mind that even such factors as merits and competency can be quite relative,



depending on the context in which they are evaluated."

2. "It should be the constant policy of the Department to have a French-speaking person occupy either the under-secretary post, or the deputy under-secretary position. For the same reason it would seem essential to have always one French-speaking person among the assistant under-secretaries.
3. The head of the Personnel Division (should) alternate between an English-speaking and a French-speaking person.
4. The serious chronic shortage of bilingual stenographers is undoubtedly the result of the persistent refusal of the Civil Service Commission to recognize the principle of special allowances for bilingual stenographers.
5. Definite steps must be made to open Washington, London and other key posts to French-speaking persons, not only because of the political necessity to have at least one French name on the roster of such posts, but on a regular and constant basis, with the same opportunities that are made available to their English-speaking colleagues.







6. Meetings between French-speaking Canadians of the Department and the leaders of the French-speaking community of Quebec, monthly. Also brief assignments to professors from French-speaking universities.

### Conclusion

The main weakness comes from the absence of French-speaking Canadians at the top echelons of the Department.

